

---

# THE CRITICAL REVIEW.

---

For the Month of *April*, 1765.

---

## ARTICLE I.

*A New and Literal Translation of all the Books of the Old and New Testament; with Notes critical and explanatory. By Anthony Purver. 2 Vols. Folio. Pr. 4l. Johnston.*

**A** Translation of the Bible, with critical annotations by one of those people \*, who have generally declaimed against human learning in matters of religion, is a new phenomenon in the literary world; an indication that the sciences are gradually extending their influence thro' all denominations of men; and that a time is approaching, in which ignorance and fanaticism will no longer be revered under the veil of religion.

The author of this performance is, in many respects, a rational expounder of the scriptures; but, in opposition to the pacific tenets of his brethren, the greatest *warrior* in literature we have ever seen. He attacks every critic and translator he meets in his way, and lays on his carnal weapons in a most unmerciful manner.

'How many, says he, turn Hebrew critics that are ignorant of the grammar, and even the right reading of it? Nay how have I evidently seen in some of their writings that they did not know Hebrew letters one from another! — The LXX discover their ignorance and rashness.—Our translators acknowledge in their preface what proficients they were in the Hebrew tongue, when they write, "such were thought upon, as could say modestly with S. Hierome, both we have learned the Hebrew tongue

---

\* Mr. Anthony Purver is a Quaker. — He followed the occupation of a shoemaker several years; but having a taste for literature, he quitted his trade, and opened a school. He is said to have employed thirty years in this translation.

Vol. XIX. *April*, 1763.

R

in

in part, and in the Latin we have been exercised almost from our very cradle." . . . It is manifest they did not understand the use of the Hebrew accents. . . . Like Hopkins in the Psalms they seem fond of vulgar idioms. . . . What shifting are they put to! . . . they leave out what they knew not how to render . . . in many instances they have made the Bible worse than it was before. . . . The *Assembly*, one may perceive, were put to it in their annotations, tho' *learned divines thereunto appointed*, to know whether *anointed* (Hab. iii. 13.) was singular or plural.—Poole and Patrick, the latter following the former, according to his custom, prove their unskilfulness in the Hebrew tongue.—Capellus is the scandal of the protestants, for writing against the Hebrew text.—Montanus sometimes makes sad nonsense.—The writers who finished Poole's annotations speak of things to little or no purpose, and with wretched pedantry.—Newton, and such famous learned men, love their works should be very singular.—Prideaux is Usher's implicit follower.—Shuckford has betrayed his ignorance of the Hebrew tongue.—Grey is for making and leaving the scriptures uncertain . . . how deservedly are such critics confounded!—The author of the Present State of the printed Hebrew Text has mangled and degraded the Holy Bible.—Mudge is a Capellian critic, and exceeds the effrontery of Capellus himself.—Some commentators proclaim their own ignorance notably. Others are not to be trusted. Others lacerate the holy scriptures, and others disgrace it.' In short, if you will believe Mr. Purver, the commentators have led him into an Augean stable, and engaged him in a crowd of *wretched pedants*, where there is hardly any thing to be heard or seen but *wild work, shiftsings, whimsies, fooleries, manglings, cavelling, jumbling, confusion, and impertinence*. The principal writers on the New Testament are censured with equal freedom; but the reader will think these instances a sufficient specimen of our author's politeness.

' Let this translation (says he) be compared with others and the original.' By these exclamations one might imagine that hardly any man in the world has understood the Bible, besides the present translator. But,

' *Parcius ista viris*'—

Why is the *modesty* of our translators to be derided? are we to depreciate their learning in proportion to their humility? or will any man assert that he is a *perfect master* of the Hebrew language? In the explication of the sacred text, it is an instance of great temerity to assume a magisterial air, and treat the learned world with contempt. A commentator may propose his own opinion, without disparaging the works of other men. At least

least the BIBLE should never be made the vehicle of contumelious reflections. If men will annex their comments to the words of inspiration, let them only presume to subjoin the ingenuous dictates of reason, and the sober illustrations of truth.

To this performance the author has prefixed some remarks on translations of the scripture in general, and this translation in particular.

‘ Axiom I.

‘ *A translation ought to be true to the original.*

‘ A translator, he observes, like a witness at the bar, should speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

‘ Translators have sometimes grievously missed of speaking truth, or rendering truly, but putting a truth instead of the truth; as for instance, in Job x. 8. *made for grieve*; it being true that the hands of God made Job, but not true that he says so by that Hebrew word, which has no such meaning.’

The Septuagint, Pagninus, Montanus, Piscator, Munster, Castalio, Vatablus, Mercer, Drusius, &c. render עָצַב in the former sense. There is no doubt but עָצַב signifies labor as well as grief, as Κοῦσ in Greek, *peine* in French, and *pains* in English. Images and idols are called עֲצָבִים *quia arte elaborata sunt*. The same word in Arabic is *a nerve*; some therefore, considering the Arabisms which occur in the book of Job, render it *ex nervis me compegerunt*. In the margin of our Bible, it is emphatically rendered *took pains about me*. Mr. Purver is too peremptory.

‘ Particular opinions operate marvelously, and like a bribe, blind the eyes of the wise. Hence the popish *ipsa conteret, she shall bruise*, Gen. iii. 15. in honour of the Virgin Mary, and dishonour to Christ; hence the Predestinarian, *in very deed for this cause have I raised thee up*, Exod. ix. 16.

‘ According to the preceding axiom, a translator should follow the original copy that is extant, which may be done here with this advantage, that while those who translate other books have the difficulty of choosing the best, the Hebrew Bible is almost invariable, and fixed to be so, whatever faults may fall out in printing or transcribing, by the Masoretical notes; in which the words are numbered, and even the peculiarities of pointing, with the places where they are throughout the scripture.’

Our author, on many occasions, expresses an uncommon veneration for the authority of the Masorets, and resolutely maintains the integrity of the present Hebrew text. But where is the absolute integrity of any copy existing, if transcribers and printers have not been infallible? and of all people in the world,



our author has the least pretensions to contend for the infallibility of transcribers and printers, since he has no less than fourteen folio columns of errata in this edition of his own translation.

But, says he, 'if we confess that the scripture was given by divine inspiration, as we must, if we believe what it says, 2 Tim. iii. 16. there can scarce, one might think, be denied to it the lesser regard of Providence for its preservation, which also peculiarly appears in the uniformity of the Hebrew original copies. But it may be enquired why then have there not been the like in the Greek? It really is more than enquired; there is so ill a use made of it by some, as to disown likewise the Hebrew being kept incorrupt, and such a providence allowed to neither. While this may be the difference, which might pass unnoticed, that the *old law* lying in the letter, required an exactness there, which the *new* being spiritual does not require; tho' the latter has it sufficiently in what is material, and *different readings* I observe have been commonly made, especially the larger sort, to be conformable to other texts. It is also undeniable that the Jews have used great diligence to keep the Hebrew scripture from being altered; whereas the Christians were so negligent as not to settle what books of the Greek should be counted scripture, till long after the time of Christ. Divine Providence however may plainly appear, in keeping the common copies of the first so exceeding similar, and of the latter so little varying materially. And a farther reason for the Hebrew scripture being providentially preserved so exactly uniform, might well be the near likeness of letters and different words in that language, to the danger of its being mistranscribed or corrupted, far beyond what there was in the Greek.'

'Particular opinions operate marvelously, and like a bribe blind the eyes of the wise!' Dr. Kennicott endeavors to rectify the errors of the Hebrew text. Our author is determined to vindicate the authority of the Masoretical copies, in opposition to all the criticisms of the doctor and the rules of grammar. He has attacked him in seventy places: The following note will exemplify his extraordinary zeal.

In the 8, 9, 11, 13, 19th verses of the first chapter of Ruth, "The pronouns, says the author of the state of the printed Hebrew text, are surprisngly corrupted." 'If it is surprisng for them to be corrupted, says our translator, is it not more likely they are not corrupted? the case might be, that this first chapter, if not the book, was a memoir made by Naomi herself, who was so illiterate, or forgetful in her language, through disuse of it for several years, that she might mistake by putting the masculine for the feminine.'

This curious observation, Friend Purver, is enough to make the gravest



gravest of thy brethren smile, and invalidates the authority of thy judgment in opposition to the learned and respectable author above-mentioned.

‘ Axiom II.

‘ *A translation should be well, or grammatically expressed, in the language it is made in.*

‘ It is well known that those called the living languages do alter, especially ours, who are such a changeable people. Hence it is necessary, that new translations should be made from one time or century to another, accommodated to the present use of speaking or writing.

‘ This deference is paid to the heathen classics, that they may appear beautiful and not barbarous; many of which are translated often, as the rest doubtless would, if their bulk or particularity did not render them unsaleable.

‘ And why should the Scripture meet with less regard? is it to be thereby more exposed to ridicule and contempt, in our libertine age? But some there are who seem possessed with a notion, or bigotry, that the last translation in king James's reign must not be altered; tho' several new ones had been made before, when the oldness of the language, as they were not long apart, did not call for it; and tho' the pedantry of that reign is become a ridicule, and the stile intolerable: nor does such a notion commonly appear to be founded on an opinion of that translation being well done, since it has been the frequent complaint, from the scripture-writers who understood the original, of passages rendered amiss.—

‘ Language was anciently rude and unpolished, and it was proper even for the inspired writings to be delivered in that of the times: hence nouns are frequently repeated in the original, where they may much better be rendered by pronouns, according to the improvements of grammar, and manner of speech now, especially in this part of the world, without any diminution or alteration of the sense at all. In such a case certainly our language is to be like itself and not made uncouth to no manner of purpose, any more than we are to speak like children, or wear skins like our first parents.’

The author cites a variety of texts in which he has made alterations of this nature. But in some instances many of his readers will think he has injured the beautiful simplicity of the sacred writers. E. g.

*It came to pass, when Jacob saw Rachel the daughter of Laban his mother's brother, and the sheep of Laban his mother's brother, that Jacob went near, and rolled the stone from the well's mouth, and watered the flock of Laban his mother's brother, and Jacob kissed Rachel, and lifted up his voice and wept, and Jacob told Rachel that he was her father's brother, Gen. xxix. 10. Mr. Purver tran-*

states this passage in the following manner: '*As soon as he saw her, the daughter of Laban, his mother's brother, and this uncle's sheep, he went nigh, and rolling off the stone from the well's mouth, watered them. Jacob also kissed Rachel, and burst out a crying; telling her that he was her father's nephew.*'

When Jacob, who was now in a foreign country, saw the daughter of his MOTHER's brother, he wept for joy. The most endearing circumstance in this interview is repeated in the original, and in our translation, with some propriety; but it is here suppressed, and the affectionate emotion of Jacob is expressed by an ordinary phrase, which rather denotes the passion of a child than the sensibility of a man.

\* A noun iterated with a preposition may be elegantly turned into an adverb: thus *whither*, for, *and into the land of Canaan*, Gen. xii. 5.—*There*, for *in Mizpah*, Jer. xli. 10.

\* So the auxiliaries or signs of the English verbs very elegantly supply the place of a verb repeated in the original, or rather are the same in our language. Thus *were*, for *were written*, Exod. xxxii. 15.—*do*, for *dwell*, Numbers xiii, 29.—*does*, for *casteth out*, Jer. vi. 7.

An auxiliary in the place of a verb frequently enervates the sentence in which it is used, and in many cases the repetition of a significant word is not offensive to the nicest ear.

\* The Hebrew using speeches direct in the second person very often, some small ones sound harshly so to us, and may be made oblique in the third person with advantage, and without the least injury, as it would have been, had our language been the original: e. g. *Jeroboam and all the people came to Rehoboam the third day, as the king had appointed, saying, Come to me again the third day*, 1 Kings xii. 12. Gen. xxxix. 19, &c.

In these instances, we are rather inclined to admire the vivacity of the oriental stile, than agree to the alteration which our author proposes.

There are many observations of this nature in the introduction, which, for the sake of brevity, we shall omit.

In an appendix, the author enumerates, 1. The words and letters in the original, which have been overlooked or neglected by our translators. 2. The words which are *added*, without being distinguished by the Italic character. 3. The articles, auxiliaries of verbs, &c. which are improperly translated. 4. Words that are clownish, barbarous, hard, technical, misapplied, new-coined, or obsolete. 5. Bad idioms, ungrammatical or uncouth expressions \*. 6. Some of the various significations of וָאֵו *vau* and וָגַם *gam*. This

---

\* The author has pointed out above three hundred expressions, which are certainly ungrammatical or uncouth, such as, *Go to for come,*

This collection of words is a proof of the extraordinary diligence of our translator.

Mr. Purver in this version closely adheres to the Masoretic copies; and, in order to justify his manner of translating several passages, endeavours to maintain 'the divine authority or certainty of the Hebrew points.' In a dissertation on this subject, he tells us, 'That before the Babylonian captivity, while Hebrew was the mother tongue of the Jewish people, as their letters are all consonants, and there was little or no necessity for vowels, it may be thought or allowed, they had but few or none of the latter. But being dispersed after the transmigration, and not living together, as their ancestors had done before in Egypt; the Chaldee, as it is agreed, was become their common language at the return from captivity: whereby there was then need of vowels for the right reading and understanding of the scripture words, the adding of which was concluded both by Jews and Christians, to be done by Ezra, that ready scribe or writer, Ez. vii. 6. assisted by the men of the great synagogue, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, with those in Ezra, ii. 2. and others.'

Our author proceeds to corroborate this opinion, and answer the objections which have been raised against it. We shall not detain our readers with a particular account of his arguments, as this matter has been debated at large by several eminent writers, and the vowel points, in our opinion, deservedly exploded, as the contrivances of more modern Jews. Masclef asserts that the points were invented 900 or 1000 years after Christ. We have reason however to believe, that in the time of St. Jerom they were entirely unknown; for, in a letter to Evagrius, he makes this observation: *Nec refert, utrum Salem, an Salim nominetur cum vocalibus in medio literis perrare utantur Hebræi, et pro voluntate lectorum, atque varietate regionum, eadem verba diversis sonis atque accentibus proferantur.*

If this was the state of the Hebrew language in the fourth century, where were the points? Certainly they had at that time no existence. *Masorethæ veteres* (says a famous Spanish grammarian)

---

come, Gen xi. 3.—Seemeth him good, *for* seems good to him, 2 Sam. x. 12.—Methinketh, *for* I think, 2 Sam. xviii. 27.—The which, *for* which, *passim*.—The wild ox, *for* wild bull, for how or why should such a one become an ox? Deut. xiv. 5.—Gat him up, *for* went up, 1 Sam. xiii. 15.—Can skill, *for* has skill, 1 Kings v. 6.—Could skill of, *for* had skill in, 2 Chr. xxxiv. 12.—Handmaid that is heir, *for* heiress, Prov. xxx. 23.—Shall not leave neither name nor remainder, *for* either name or remainder, 2 Sam. xiv. 7.—both twain, *for* both of them, Ezek. xxi. 19, &c.



*duas tantum motiones nominant : quàmets, sub quo tsere comprehendunt, & pathabb, quo nomine etiam segbol nuncupant. Aben Ezra, qui medio duodecimi sæculi florebat, septem duntaxat motiones memorat, nimirum quàmets, tsere, kbolem, schoureq, pathabb, bbiriq, & segbol, quarum Massorethas Tiberienses auctores agnoscit. Posteriores itaque Rabbini cætras addiderunt. Guarini Gram. Heb.*

It is most probable they borrowed these points from the Arabs; and it is certain that the first copies of the Korân were without them.

‘But,’ says Mr. Purver, ‘what a case would the scripture be in then, if it had no points, or if those it has were but the work of some later Jews? . . . ‘It is true, the sense of the context would often determine it without the points, but not always in such a multitude of various cases as occur in scripture.

‘Thus in the septuagint version מטה in Gen. xlvii. 31. is rendered *a staff*, by others *a bed*, the consonants signifying either; and as it is not related whether Jacob was up, and so leaning on the top of a staff or in a bed, the vowels only shew it was the latter.’

The points shew what sense the punctators annexed to this word, and nothing more.

‘It is the placing of a point settles the meaning, Gen. xlix. 6. שור being *a wall* and *an ox*, or collectively *oxen*, with either of which the verb *extirpate* or *root out* will agree. The pointing decides for the latter, notwithstanding the inattention of our translators, and the authority of Aben Ezra, an author fond of new things.’

Till we admit the sacred authority of the points, or the *jus divinum* of the punctators, we shall be guided by the context, where any ambiguous word occurs.

Suppose a school-boy should read these lines of Mr. Pope:

‘Commas and points they set exactly right,  
And ’twere a sin to rob them of their mite,’

he would not want a point or an accent to inform him that the last word, in this couplet, is to be understood in a figurative sense, and does not signify the twentieth part of a grain, the third part of a farthing, nor a small animalcule in a cheese: the context would sufficiently explain the author’s meaning; if not, rational criticism, and not authority, should determine the question.

Interpreters, as Mr. Purver asserts, have run into great absurdities in chronology; he has therefore taken some pains to ascertain the date of every memorable event, according to the *Hebrew* text, and for this purpose has furnished his readers with a variety of chronological tables.

The curious reader will perhaps be diverted with an hypothesis, by which our author proposes to regulate the computation of the patriarchal ages.

\* All \* the writers, he says, who have undertaken to calculate the space of time from the creation to the flood, have, I think missed it. Such as were not misled by the Greek and Samaritan copies, but computed from the Hebrew, have stated it at 1656 years; by supposing the son was born, when the Scripture says he was begot, and that invariably each of them, at the end of such a year of his father's life; positions *methinks* too improbable to be allowed, much less so generally received.

Since Moses says nothing of the odd months or days, and this might probably live one, that two, and another three quarters of a year, longer than the time mentioned when they begot a son; a medium for one with another would have a year overplus: so the time is said to be seven years, 1 Kings ii. 11. which was seven years six months, 2 Sam. v. 5. But if any of them lived almost the year out, or till the last quarter, it was counted for a year; then between one quarter before, and three quarters of a year after, the mean time is one quarter more than the years mentioned. By this allowance, moderate as it is, if Adam, when he had lived  $130 \frac{1}{4}$  years begot Seth, he was 131 years at Seth's birth, and so of the rest. According to the other account, Methuselah must have lived till the end of the flood, when Noah was 600 years old, ch. vii. 11. and ix. 28, 29. he being not 969 before that reckoning, as may be seen by adding 187, ch. v. 25. 182, ver. 28. and 600 together: to avoid which, the index to the present folio Bible has it computed with others, that he died before he was 969 years old, in contradiction to the text.

The author of that computation supposed that Methuselah died when he was in the 969th year of his age, about the commencement of the flood; and that a small part of that year in computing his life might be called, in general terms, a year.

I will add, says Mr. Purver, two or three remarks on what Usher says for the common opinion, in his Chron. Sac. p. 55, 56, who argues that the word for *begot* in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, is common both to father and mother, and oftener denotes the birth than the conception. Well, since that verb has different meanings, and when it is used of the mother, that determines it to signify her bearing or being delivered of a child, does it not accordingly when used of the father mean the other?

\* Why does Mr. Purver claim the discovery of this hypothesis to himself, and say that *all* are mistaken, since it appears by a quotation, that he has read a passage in Usher's Chronology, in which one Jacobus Auzoleus is said to have maintained the same opinion?



As for which way it may be found most, that is only as the subject requires. An instance for this purpose would have been where it was said of the father, and evidently signified the birth of the child; but no such appears. That great man too, learned, ingenious, and worthy as he was, mistakes in bringing Mat. i. 16. for a proof, that the word is common to both sexes: for *γεννηθῆναι* is not said of Mary, but Jesus. To conclude, when the Scripture applies a child's birth to the father, it has another and a proper way for doing it, as may be seen ch. xxi. 5. & alibi.

It is amazing that Mr. Purver should charge this author with a mistake, when he himself makes it, or wilfully misrepresents his meaning. The archbishop does not pretend to assert any thing so absurd as our translator would make his readers believe; for he quotes the whole verse, in which *γεννησθαι* is applied to Jacob; and Luke i. 57. in which the same word is applied to Elizabeth.

*Abraham*, it is said, Acts vii. 8. *begat Isaac, and circumcised him the eighth day*; which seems to imply, that *begat* in this passage refers to the birth of Isaac. But in the name of wonder, who ever talked of having begotten a son till that son appeared? and how shall the time of conception be ascertained? or, upon our author's supposition, how could Adam, when he was *an hundred and thirty years old* be said to have begotten a son in his likeness, after his image, and called his name *Seth*? Purver tells us in his chronological table, consistently with his hypothesis, that *Seth* was *born* when Adam was 131 years old; and therefore, when he was only 130, *Seth* must have been an admirable image of his father! and received his name nine months before his birth!

This curious hypothesis occasions a difference of eight years in computing the time between the creation of the flood, and brings down the latter event to the year of the world, 1664.

[ *To be continued.* ]

II. *A Revival of Shakespear's Text, wherein the Alterations introduced into it by the more modern Editors and Critics, are particularly considered.* 8vo. Pr. 6s. 6d. Johnston.

**I**N the course of our observations on this work, we apprehend that we have undeniably proved this reviser, as well as his antagonists, to have been deficient as to the fundamentals of what ought to constitute true criticism, we mean the knowledge of Shakespear's language, so far as relates to individual words, or the ideas annexed to them when that great poet lived. What a figure must a critic upon Virgil, or any of the Roman



Roman classics make, should he pronounce *illi* to be a word evidently CORRUPT, because the dative of *ille* is *illi*, or that *quiris* is no Latin word, because none of the etymologists have accounted for its derivation.

Had we room to spare, we could carry this observation much farther, and prove, that even a syntax prevailed in Shakespear's time different from what is now commonly received; and we might, perhaps, carry the like observations through all the other parts of grammar. This theatrical vernacularity seems, for very obvious reasons, to have been lost between the years 1638 and 1665, when a species of another, but a more, depraved kind, took place, and which we have the pleasure to observe is now discouraged by the improving taste and morals of the public. Terence had no vernacularities; the plays of Shakespear could not, when exhibited, have been received without them.

We agree with the reviser, that in the above play, neither Mr. Theobald nor Mr. W—— had the smallest pretext in criticism, or reason, for altering the two following passages: *for the revolt of mine is dangerous — why, I'll exhibit a bill in the parliament, for putting down of men.* Our reviser's observation on the latter passage is as follows:

'I can see no pretext, not even the slightest, for introducing *mum* in this place. It is a German, not a Flemish liquor, and Falstaff, as is well known, dealt chiefly in sack. The preceding appellation of 'Flemish drunkard' alludes to the general corpulency of that people, a circumstance which in the satirical representations of it is continued to this very day. Mr. Theobald's conjecture, 'for the putting down of *fat men*,' is much more tolerable. But I can see no reasonable objection to the common reading, 'for the putting down of *men*,' that is, for the restraining the licentious impudence of men, and taking them, as the vulgar phrase is, a peg lower. But the simplicity of it seems to have disgusted Mr. Warburton, whose profusion of learning on this occasion is beside every other purpose, except that of throwing dust in the eyes of the reader.'

We are, however, of opinion, that the original reading may be supported from the common usage of the language in Shakespear's time; and that the *putting a man down*, signified to *record* him for what he really is, a fool, a lecher, a villain, or the like; and our opinion, which is more than conjecture, may be supported by a vast variety of instances.

The reviser introduces a very long note to vindicate the original printing of the following passage in the same play, spoken by Mrs. Ford — *These knights will back, and so thou shouldst not alter the article of thy gentry.* We agree with this writer in preserving the common reading *back*, instead of the ridiculous emendation

emendation *lack*, introduced by Mr. W——, who is severely castigated by our author on this occasion. Let us now see the manner in which the latter supports his opinion. ‘To *hack* (says he) is to cut, wound, or slash; and as the proper employment of a knight in that age was fighting, hacking or slashing may be imputed to them without impropriety, as the practice of their profession. But, as they could not be supposed to exercise their valour on the persons of their mistresses, we must conclude this hacking to be intended of their reputations. If so the sense will be, “If you are so fond of quality as to be flattered with the addresses of a knight, your reputation will be in danger of being wounded and mangled by his boasting of favours, which perhaps you have never granted. You had better therefore be content with your present quality of a plain gentlewoman, than be ambitious of the title of my Lady, at the expence of being pointed at as a Knight’s paramour.” I am by no means sure that I have hit on the poet’s meaning in this very obscure passage, but at least I have not interpreted it into nonsense.’

Notwithstanding this modest diffidence, we must be of opinion, that this critic might have made much better sense of it, if he had studied for some other signification of the word *hack*, than that of slashing one’s flesh or reputation. Might there be no allusion to the well known punishment of a recreant, a cowardly or pilfering, knight, such as Falstaff was, *having his spurs HACK’D from his heels*? Was not the word *hack*, as now, applied to mean mercenary practices? A reviser of Shakespear ought to have enquired into those particulars. For our own part, we scarcely make a doubt that the term *hack* here is Shakespear’s word, but that it has no relation to cutting or slashing, and signifies moving, going from one place to another like the old English hackneys, which attended the king’s expeditions, and were sent to and from all parts of the country to bring provisions for the troops. Let the reader consider the passage in this sense, and pronounce whether the meaning is not more clear and easy, than that given by this critic.

Our reviser thus comments upon Ford’s soliloquy, in which is the following line, *And stand so firmly on his wife’s frailty*.

‘Mr. Warburton takes great pains to explain and justify this reading, but, in my opinion, with little success. To consider his own illustration: if I stood on a rotten bridge, and one, to warn me of my danger, should tell me, I stood firmly on a rotten plank, I should think it very extraordinary language. So if any one should tell me his neighbour was a secure fool, and rested upon his wife’s frailty, I should conclude it to be a slip of his tongue, or that he affected to talk nonsense. Mr. Upton, Critic. Observ. p. 176, goes another way to work. According



ording to him, Ford was going to say *honesty*, but corrects himself, and adds unexpectedly, *frailty*, with an emphasis. I must own this appears to me too studied and affected to be probable. I therefore readily agree with Mr. Theobald and Sir Thomas Hanmer in substituting *fealty*, or rather, to avoid ambiguity, though the alteration be somewhat greater, *fidelity*."

Thou sacred rage of correcting! to what absurdities dost thou not impel human brains, *quid non mortalia pectora cogis!* never, surely, did words carry a more evident meaning than those do. *On his wife's frailty*: to every one but a critic, the obvious meaning of Ford, is, that Page is very obstinate on *the subject* of his wife's frailty, and that he stands upon it like a secure fool, who thinks himself firm. Our reviser, for the *tire-wellet*, made use of by the old quarto edition in Falstaff's speech to Mrs. Ford, thinks that possibly, the poet might have written the *tire-wel-wet*. He should have informed himself that the *tire-wellet* is part of the dress of a nun, and signifies no more than a white double handkerchief. We must in general observe, that this author is seldom mistaken when he supports the ancient readings; and when he ventures to amend, he is far more tolerable than any of the editors he condemns.

We now proceed to the Merchant of Venice: "Mr. Pope was mistaken in imagining the word, *argosie*, to signify 'a ship from *Argo*.' This last is an inland town of the Morea, and consequently could have no shipping. In the primary signification of the word, it denoted a ship of Ragusa; and as that city was in the middle ages famous for its trade and extensive navigation, and particularly for building merchant ships of the largest size, every very large merchant vessel came to be called an *Argosie*. Hence too *Ragozine*, for *Ragusain*, the name of the pirate in Measure for Measure."

Indeed Mr. Reviser you are as far mistaken as Mr. Pope, and you here give us a fresh instance of the necessity a critic upon Shakespear is under to understand Shakespear's language. An *Argosie* in its etymology has a relation to the ship *Argos*, in which the Argonauts sailed; and in Shakespear's time every large ship, especially a trading one, was called an *Argosie*, without the smallest allusion to Ragusa.

This author we think is unhappy in the following observation:

*'And when love speaks, the voice of all the Gods  
Makes heaven drowse with the harmony.'*

That is, whenever love speaks, all the gods join their voices with his inharmonious concert.

That Mr. W. is, if possible, still more absurd we shall admit; but we must think that the natural meaning of the passage,



sage, is, that when Love speaks, if all the Gods were to speak after him, heaven would turn inattentive or drowsy.

The following passage admits of some dispute :

*While greasy Jone doth keel the pot.*

'The monthly Magazines have taught us, that the verb, *keel*, is a northern word, and signifies to *cool*; and that the meaning of the whole line is, while the greasy house-maid doth by the help of her ladle cool the pot, and prevent the broth from boiling over, which she is preparing for the supper of the labourers at their return from the field.'

The reviser ought to have mentioned, that in the North the word *keel*, or as it is pronounced in Scotland *kale*, signifies greens fit for the pot, such as cabbages, coleworts, &c. and that it is usual for the pot to be boiling for some time before the keel is put into it, which is called kaling, or keeling the pot.

In our author's remark upon the following line in the *Taming of the Shrew*;

*I am arriv'd from fruitful Lombardy,*

he tells, us 'that Pisa is a city of Tuscany, not of Lombardy.' But every one who is conversant in the old English language knows, that our ancestors, and indeed, the Italians themselves, comprehended all Tuscany in Lombardy. The street of the Lombards, or Lombard-street, got its name from the Florentines, who were settled there in or before the reign of Edward III. and the chief of them became bankrupts by his failing to repay the money they lent him.

In our author's criticism upon the *Twelfth Night*, the following passage occurs;

*'Cottiers catches,*

'The old reading, *coziers catches*, that is, *coblers catches*, in which sense the word is still used in the western part of this kingdom, ought undoubtedly to be restored. See the *Canons of Criticism*, p. 51. Its etymology is from *cordwainer*, which was first abbreviated into *cordier*, and then by degrees, in virtue of the western pronunciation, *coardier*, came to be *cozier*.'

This is another instance of the necessity of understanding Shakespear's language. The *coziers*, or *codgers*, (as they are called in the North) were people who travelled about selling fish or other provisions in *wicker baskets* from town to town, which are in old French called *côzieres*, a word that has no manner of relation to *cordovanniere* or *cordwainer*.

In the *Winter's Tale*, we find an observation of equal sagacity with the preceding:

*'To let him there a month, beyond the gift  
Prefix'd for's parting.*

‘ Mr. Warburton defends this reading, and informs us, that *gest* signifies a stage or journey.’ Be it so. Let us therefore substitute either of those two words in the place of *gest*, and we shall still find the passage will be nonsense. I am inclined to believe our poet wrote,

—————*beyond the list,*  
that is, beyond the limit; in which sense Shakespear hath several times used that word.’

The ignorance of the meaning of the word *gests* among all the commentators of Shakespear is very surprizing; but it must be owned that Mr. W. has in the passage before us come nearest its meaning. Before a king of England undertook a progress, the lord-chamberlain, or proper officer presented him with a paper, containing the *gests*, (which we suppose to have come from the French word *gift*) and it regulated not only the places where the king was to lie every night, but the time of his continuing at each. The word is very common in old writers, and may be yet seen in the sense we have explained it in the hand of a royal author, Edward VI. in his journal published by bishop Burnet. In this signification we hope Shakespear's original stands unimpeached, and if we may be allowed a pun, will remain master of the *lists*. We have been the more full in explaining this term, because it occurs more than once in Shakespear, and has occasioned his text receiving many a dreadful stab from the pens of his editors and revisers.

The bounds we are obliged to prescribe to ourselves in reviewing a work of the bulk before us, do not suffer us to give farther particulars of the author's verbal mistakes, especially as we are in hopes of soon reviewing an edition of Shakespear, which will be final and decisive of that great poet's text. We cannot, however, take leave of the work before us, without again doing the author the justice to own, that Shakespear's text is greatly obliged to his labours in establishing the authority of its original printing. In intricate passages, where there is no disputes about printing, punctuation, or words, he has been very happy in his explanations; and a reader, who is not a professed critic, may study Shakespear in his closet with far more ease and advantage than he did before. We are, however, of opinion, that this author takes too much pains in confuting readings and emendations that confute themselves, and sometimes in establishing meanings that are clear to the lowest capacity. He does not write in the liberal manner that should prevail among gentlemen and scholars; and he has taken more pains to understand Shakespear's meaning than his words; two studies which have so mutual a relation, that they ought to be inseparable.



III. *An Introduction to the Art of Reading, with Energy and Propriety.* By John Rice. 8vo. Pr. 4s. Tonson.

Professors of speaking and reading are of very late growth in this country, and we wish that their trade may be as beneficial to literature as it is to themselves. Times have been when great writers in verse and prose have flourished, and when their works have been read, without the readers being taught the true method of pronouncing them; but we have never heard that they suffered for want of a professorial chair, for the art of reading with energy and propriety.

Those are two properties that, with Mr. Rice's leave, can never be taught or communicated; they must arise from the organs, the feelings, and, above all, the good sense of the reader. Even the latter alone will not succeed. Mr. Dryden, who had certainly as musical an ear for English poetry as any man ever had, could not read (as we have been told by Mr. Cibber and others) his own or any other writings, so as to be understood. All the labours of a Rice or a Sheridan would have been lost upon Mr. Pope; nor can we think that any of the mechanical or common rules of prosody are necessary towards forming harmonious and correct versification. An ear for music and an ear for poetry are so very different, that the great poet last mentioned used to express his admiration to his friend Dr. Arbuthnot, what merit could there be found in Handel! His music, said he, affects me with no other sensation than what I feel from noise. Many a bard, like Pope, with a true English poetical ear, has written harmoniously in verse, without knowing the difference between a spondee and a dactyl, an anapæst, a trochaic or an iambic. In like manner, we have heard many readers, who, possessed of the qualities we have already mentioned, without one of the rules laid down by Mr. Rice, have given us more pleasure, and delivered themselves with a truer emphasis, than all the knowledge of mechanical rules can communicate.

In the mean while, we are far from saying, that a long study of those rules, by a man who has *nothing else to do*, may not assist him in the art of reading, especially if he applies himself at the same time to get rid of that little portion of feeling and understanding which nature may have been unkind enough to bestow upon him. From the perusal we have had of Mr. Rice's book, his pupil must be *aut Cæsar aut nihil*, either his wholly or nothing. Having premised these general observations, which indignation indeed partly extorted from us, we shall now proceed to the work itself.

Blainville in his travels through Germany, tells us of an artist at Nuremberg, ' who could make a hundred little cups  
of



of ivory turned, and perfectly well proportioned, with a ring to each, that plays and raps against the body of the cup, all of which are contained in a grain of pepper.' This must be inconceivably ingenious; nor is it the less so, because it is of no manner of use. Art and utility, however, are, we think, very agreeable companions, and, in mechanical affairs, are always sorry to see the former separated from the latter. Mr. Rice, we acknowledge, is an artist in his profession; but we must be excused from giving it a higher epithet than mechanical. His first chapter treats of observations on the defects and perfection of reading in general; and here he discovers an analogy between reading and writing, which he modestly presumes, in a note, 'may be of some service also to writers, by inducing them to pay attention to the manner in which their works may be recited; a circumstance that will necessarily improve and meliorate their style, whether they compose in prose or verse.' From this hint, we are in hopes that this ingenious author will proceed to establish lectures for the improvement of authorship, as well as reading. He says, in the same note, 'It hath been observed by some writers on this subject, that poets may be able to arrange their words properly in metre, according to the rules of versification, even if they were ignorant of the proper accent and emphasis of words. Such poetry could not fail, however, of being extremely defective; for the reasons hereafter assigned.'

He must indeed be a strange poet, who is ignorant of the emphasis of words, however unable he may be to pronounce them, either properly accented or properly emphasized.

'Reading (says Mr. Rice) may with propriety, be called artificial speaking; as it is, indeed, the imitation of natural eloquence. Hence, like all other imitative arts, its end is defeated by every appearance of study, habit, or affectation. Any peculiarity of tone and manner of reading, therefore, must be disgusting, as it is unnatural; in like manner the studied artifices of *declamation* are equally exceptionable, and for the same reason.

'It is nevertheless very certain that, as there are few common readers, who have not a disagreeable habitual tone; so there are few pretended adepts in this art, who are not mere declaimers.'

We can by no means subscribe to this opinion; nor do we, from Mr. Rice's performance, conceive so high an opinion of his abilities, as to acknowledge him a dictator, even in the art of reading. What he means by *reading* being one of the imitative arts, is next to incomprehensible. All reading is speaking, tho' all speaking is not reading. We can define painting, sculpture, and other imitative arts by their ends and properties, but read-

ing can be defined only by itself; nor can we see how the end of it, which is, that what is read should be understood by others, is at all defeated by an appearance either of study or habit, which we take, in reading, to be what a manner is in painting. This may be good as well as bad; nay, it may be difficult, if not impossible, to change it for the better. There is not a judge of painting who can be ignorant, that the airs of Raphael's heads and the contours of Poussin's figures are studied from the antique, and that each of them have a manner; but he must be a wretched connoisseur, who should pronounce that study and a manner are blemishes in either of those masters. As to affectation, it is a defect of judgment, or the consequence of a bad habit; and Mr. Rice will find great difficulty in curing it in any person, as men are generally fonder of their imperfections than accomplishments. With respect to Mr. Rice's general censure of common readers and pretended adepts, the plain English of it is, Gentlemen and ladies, you think you can read well, but you deal only in rattling and bombast; nor can you ever be understood till you buy my book, and attend my lectures.

It has been often disputed, whether exquisite sensations of any kind afford greater degrees of pleasure or pain to mankind. We are apt to pronounce for the latter: an exquisite ear, for instance, meets with five hundred torments for one gratification; and the same may be said of smelling, seeing, feeling, and, perhaps, tasting. A man may have a true ear in reading, tho' it may not be exquisite, and cannot judge of the extasies of pleasure, which the observance of Mr. Rice's, or indeed any other rules, may communicate to a very refined connoisseur: we apprehend, indeed, the latter is so very rarely to be met with, that were we to demolish the whole present practice of reading to admit Mr. Rice's system, we should act like the epicure, who threw away all the pidgeon but the rump.

The great source of vicious habits in reading, is the erroneous method of teaching children to *read* before they learn to *write*, or the making them *recite* what they do not *understand*. I should be glad to know of what use it is, to teach children to gabble over a parcel of words, the meaning of which they do not comprehend, as is almost universally the custom, unless it be with a design that the little prattlers may divert their parents something more agreeably than mere perroquets. Of this, at least, I am certain, that it would be of great utility, in more ways than one, if children were not taught to pronounce their letters, till they were taught to delineate them; and that they should first learn to write and read their own words and sentiments, and not recite or copy those of others. There is not a more vicious custom, in the whole practice of modern edu-



cation, than that of setting youth to get verses, or declamations, and to repeat them by rote. This custom, I know, is adopted with a view to exercise the memory; but, setting aside the absurdity of exercising the memory with retention of mere *sounds*; it is very certain that a vacant mind will retain *things* much better than one which is overcharged with superfluous ideas; and perhaps this vacuity is one reason why the memory is better in youth than in age. Be this, however, as it will, it is at all ages much easier to learn to remember, than to learn to forget: and yet the latter is full as necessary as the former; young persons finding themselves, on entering into life, more bewildered by the prejudices of their education (i. e. what they remember to have been *taught*) than from their real ignorance of the world, or what they have still to *learn*. And hence it is, that in applying the acquisitions made in their education to any good purpose, they are obliged to throw aside, and to forget the greater part of them.

‘It may seem strange, that I should dissuade preceptors from teaching children to read till they teach them to write, and at the same time to write and read their own expressions; the reasons for it, however, are very obvious; as, by so doing, children will acquire so strong a sense of that analogy which subsists between reading and speaking, that they can never fall into the vicious habits of reciting otherwise than they converse: In which case, nothing more would be requisite to enable them to read any work with propriety, than the perfect comprehension of the author’s sense; which is not, as before observed, altogether sufficient for grown persons at present.’

Our author, in order to be acquitted of advancing, in the above quotation, the most impracticable and presumptuous paradoxes, must be tried by a jury of his peers; school-masters and school-mistresses, before the bar of Common Sense, and prevail on counsellor Experience to plead his cause. In what miserable mists of ignorance has this poor country, and indeed all Europe, been groping, as to the important point of education, till they were dispelled by the beams of Mr. Rice’s knowledge? Even classical scholars and poets, till he *moved upon the face of their understanding*, dealt in a chaos of different idioms and scholastic phraseology. But, to say the truth, after the strictest attention, we cannot discover one grain of meaning in the above quotation. The phrase of *learning to forget* in the text is, we apprehend merely figurative and ideal, and bears a quite different sense from that of *learning to remember*, which is real and practicable. In short, Mr. Rice, in preaching up the doctrine of *learning to forget*, puts us in mind of dean Swift, when his beef was over-roasted, ordering his cook to take it back to the kitchen, and do it less.

Upon the whole, we ought to be serious on every subject that regards education, without too wantonly hazarding experiments. The present system has produced many great men in all the arts and in all ages: that proposed by Mr. Rice is inconsistent with all that ever went before. Quintilian wrote upon the same subject with him; but the practice he recommends is the reverse of that of Mr. Rice, who has nothing in common with that great antient, except his blaming the modes of education then in use. Speaking of children learning to write, says he, *Altis radicibus nixus paratur, scribere ipsum*, that is, the practice of writing should be deeply rooted in the early part of life; but he was so far from recommending the precedence of writing before reading, that he very sensibly says, *Quoniam adhuc circa res tenues moramur, ii quoque versus qui ad imitationem scribendi proponuntur, non otiosas velim sententias habeant, sed honestum aliquid monentes*. "Hitherto we have dwelt upon trifling matters: even the copies set him for the improvement of his hand-writing ought not to be an unmeaning set of words, but to convey some beautiful sentiment, the remembrance of which will stick to him when he is old; and when stamp'd upon his tender mind, the impression will ever improve his morals." We should be glad to know what benefit Quintilian's pupil could receive from this precept, if he could not read?

Our author next proceeds to treat of the analysis of speech, in which he comprehends a variety of divisions, and discovers an important secret, that there is an essential distinction between speaking and singing; and after quoting lord Kaims and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, he arranges the precedence of the five vowels, and differs from his lordship, (whom, by the bye, he takes to be a man of quality) and then makes a number of profound revelations, the most intelligible of which we shall give our readers.

\* He is mistaken therefore in supposing the voice, in passing through the cavity of the mouth, acquires by articulation a different tone. It is true in general, as he affirms, "that the air, in passing thro' cavities, differing in size, produceth various sounds, some high, or sharp, some low and flat: that a small cavity occasions a high sound, and a large cavity a low sound." His lordship, however, forgets to take along with him the *velocity* with which it is necessary the air should pass through those apertures, before it can possibly occasion any sound at all, in its passage.

These sagacious observations are followed by above a dozen pages equally instructive; in which our author most undeniably proves, that we speak by means of the throat, the tongue and the teeth, and that without them we could only bellow.

He



He next proceeds to treat of the length of syllables in English, and here he banishes all variety of tone from reading and speaking, 'excepting (continues he, with most notable precision and intelligibility) that of *sentences* immediately under the influence of the *meaning* of the discourse.' At the same time he does not pretend that all syllables or simple sounds are of the same tone; and this is illustrated by two tunes set in score to the following beautiful words, *bat, bet, hit, bot, but*. We are then informed, that Scaliger and Priscian define a syllable to be an element; that 'others have defined it as an articulate voice of an individual sound,'—but that 'the vowels, when uttered singly, are undoubtedly single sounds.'

We are sensible how unfair and how easy it is, by partial quotations, to ridicule or misrepresent any work, and that detached sentences, even from the Bible itself, may become blasphemy; but this can only happen in works that proceed from simple principles to establish the most sublime truths on the most important discoveries. Mr. Rice's work is *qualis ab incapto*, and preserves an even tenour of significancy through the whole. His great aim seems to be to demolish his antagonist, Mr. Sheridan, and others, who have found such *trifling* either amusing or profitable. His observations upon English poetry preserve the same strain of obvious criticism, which every man of common sense has within himself, and few or none of his remarks have even the merit of novelty. At last he becomes the important judge of eloquence, in preaching, pleading, and public speaking. He condemns the saucy tongue of rattling eloquence, thro' which, as he informs us in a note, "acts of parliament are frequently passed only to be repealed; and orders of court are made only to be reversed." We cannot, however, see what connection this observation has with Mr. Rice's subject; and not to mention that it is false in fact, we think it is illiberally introduced, and that it squints at some private purpose or resentment. As to the Appendix, containing 'the sketch of a plan for establishing a criterion, by which the pronunciation of languages may be ascertained, and in particular that of the English tongue reduced to a certain fixt standard,' we shall make no animadversions upon it, as the whole of it has not appeared.

Though we are of opinion, that Mr. Rice's book cannot be of the least use to the public, yet we admire him as an artist in his way, by making such flimsy materials hang together, as much as we do the German genius above-mentioned, or the conjurer Jonas with his cards, cups, and garters.

IV. *Museum Rusticum et Commerciale: or, Select Papers on Agriculture, Commerce, Arts, and Manufactures. Drawn from Experience, and communicated by Gentlemen engaged in these Pursuits. Revised and digested by several Members of the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce. Vol. III. 8vo. Pr. 6s. Davis.*

THE third volume of this work, on which we are going to comment, contains one hundred articles, forming not only an entertaining but a very interesting and useful variety.

We congratulate the editors, on their successfully concentrating the labours of so many valuable correspondents. The great number of useful pieces published in this work sufficiently testify that agriculture has within these few years been greatly improved in England; but the misfortune hitherto has been, that the knowledge of improvements could circulate but very slowly, for want of a proper channel of communication to diffuse them through every part of the king's dominions.

If a farmer accidentally makes any new discovery in husbandry, he immediately endeavours to confine the practice of it to himself and his family: whence this desire proceeds is not perhaps difficult to account for, it arising from self-interest, envy, and avarice. The education of farmers is, in general, narrow: their souls not being expanded by sentiments of urbanity and benevolence, they find it difficult to look beyond *self*, and seldom forbear envying the good fortune of their neighbours; self-interest is too often their governing principle, and avarice assists in the accomplishment of their sordid views.

It must surely argue a wretched depravity of mind, when we are able to refuse doing good to our neighbours, though we can effect it without injury to ourselves; and how much more wretched must he be, who not only refuses to do good to individuals, but even to improve his country in general! Such are those who churlishly conceal practical discoveries, which might, if made known, be of infinite advantage to the British nation, nay, perhaps to the whole world.

Let us hope, as this country is now, through the variety of publications daily issuing from the press, more enlightened than it ever was at any preceding period, that farmers will partake of the general advantage derived from this encreased knowledge; and that they will hereby be induced to open their stores for the benefit of their brethren. If they need examples, let them resort to the volume now under consideration, where they will perceive that many an honest man, in  
homely



homely phrase (for elevation of style is not expected in the writings of farmers) has told his useful tale, induced by no other motive than that of doing good to mankind. Let every one who has aught valuable to impart, communicate his knowledge; and arts and sciences will of themselves improve, without the assistance of laboured plans to bring them to perfection.

But to return to our more immediate subject: We find in this third volume of the *Museum Rusticum* so many truly valuable pieces, that were we to regard them all properly, this article would be extended to an undue length; therefore we shall only mention such as we imagine may prove particularly useful or entertaining to our readers.

We find, in number VII. page 26, a description, accompanied by an engraved representation, of a drill for sowing beans, actually used in the Vale of Aylesbury. We think this worth notice, as being the most simple drill-machine we ever saw or heard of: it is in the form of a wheel barrow, and being driven up the furrow before the plough, drops the beans as regularly as can be desired. In the same letter is also described a triangular harrow for weeding horse-beans.

In number XI. page 33, are some very sensible remarks on the process of making salt-petre, occasioned by Mr. Jeremiah Brown's method, which was inserted in the first volume of the *Museum Rusticum*, and published by order of the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, &c. The principal design of these remarks is to enforce the doctrine, that animal as well as vegetable substances may, by putrefaction, be productive of nitre; and Glauber and Stahl have long since declared themselves of this opinion.

Number XIII. page 63, certainly deserves attention; as it rectifies an error frequently committed in brewing. This letter being short, we shall insert it for the benefit of our readers; but must first premise, that there is a certain quaintness in the style, which induces us to conjecture that the writer has assumed a character to which he is not perhaps strictly entitled.

'As I deal pretty largely in the hop trade, I beg leave to communicate, through the channel of your useful book, an injurious charge that is often brought against me by most of my customers, and which, I doubt not, is as frequently the case with others in the same way of trade; for though I always give the best price, and am a sufficient judge which are the best goods, yet when I have retailed them out to my customers, seldom a week passes but some of them complain of the excessive sweetness of their ale, and the intolerable bitterness of their small beer,

‘Our ‘squire the other day swore his ale was like honey, and his small beer like foot; and became in such a passion with me, that all I could say to *his honour* could not appease him.

‘I desired leave to examine his butler in what manner he brewed: to this he consented, but at the same time said he would be bound to be hanged if any man in England knew how to brew good beer better than Humphrey; notwithstanding which, *Humphrey*, not the hops, was the cause why I had his *honour*’s anger: and as I durst not tell him Humphrey’s ignorance, I am in hopes he will find it out when he sees the cause truly stated in your *Museum Rusticum*; for not only Humphrey, but Tom, Dick, and Harry, are all guilty of Humphrey’s fault.

‘When they have made their strong beer, or ale wort, they put in the hops in the same manner that they received them from my shop: the consequence is, that the richer and better the wort is, the less it will partake of the essence of the hop. The rich fat wort sheathes up the pores of the hop, and, as it were, embalms the leaves, so that the beer, or ale wort, can extract scarcely any part of the necessary quality of the hop: but when it is put into the small beer wort, a fluid of a more thin nature, then the pores are unsheathed, and the small beer is rendered as bitter *as foot*, while the ale is as sweet *as honey*. Now, if Humphrey, Tom, Dick, and Harry, will previously soak the hops in a pail or two of hot water, the hop will administer its good qualities impartially, and preserve the ‘squire’s beer to a proper age, and me from the imputation of being an unfair dealer.

‘To confirm the truth of my observation, take a quarter of an ounce of the best green tea, and instead of pouring on it simple boiling water, let the water have the same quantity of sugar boiled in it that would be necessary to sweeten so much tea when made, and you will find that the sweetness of the water will prevent its extracting the grateful bitter flavour of the tea. In short, the reason is so obvious, that I am persuaded Humphrey will soak his hops, and make an allowance for the additional water so used in his first account; and that this method will produce the squire good beer, and me, and every hop merchant that is honest, a good name.’

In number XV, is contained a method of rendering putrid water sweet, by mixing it with common clay, and letting it afterwards settle. The quantity of clay must be sufficient to take off its transparency, so that the hand held just under the surface will not appear through it. This method being approved of in the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, by the

com-



committee of chemistry, we presume the fact is sufficiently ascertained.

The succeeding letter affords some useful observations on the insects which destroy pines and firs; and towards the latter end is a passage worthy the perusal of naturalists, containing an account of a newly discovered insect. We shall, on that account, lay it before our readers. Our anonymous writer says:

‘ This season I have discovered another insect, unknown to any planter I ever met with, and yet seeming to be one which will destroy more trees than all other accidents put together; there being but few trees or shrubs, evergreens excepted, but what are killed by this insect at moving, although hitherto they have been supposed to be killed by the season, or some other accidents.

‘ It is not very busy till April; for which reason your early-shooting trees often escape: but at that time it is upon most young trees that are newly planted, and eats the outward bark off in many places all round the shoots; which causes them to look brown, and die: in others it eats out the eye of the shoots, and that often when they have begun to bud out finely for growing; by which means it kills all the part above ground: but if the tree is of the fruit sort, it will often shoot out at the bottom from the stock. If a proper attention is not given to find out means to destroy those insects, which are of the fly kind, they will be a great nuisance to all planters.

‘ Last year I had a large quantity of fruit trees spoiled by them, which were not transplanted; and also numbers of shrubs and roses killed: and this year they began to attack a large quarter of new-grafted apples, and numbers of choice shrubs, so that I was greatly frightened at the havoc which they made; but I soon discovering some of them, and, as they at that time could not fly, they were easily killed.

‘ This insect is of the fly kind, near the size of the fern-fly, but more taper, and longer, and of a greyish colour, with a small sharp head, and two long horns, or feelers. Those I saw had no wings, but I suppose they have them in May, at which time they are all gone.’

Number XXX. is a letter from John Mills, esq; respecting the burnet cultivated by Mr. Rotque.

This letter, which is a vindication of Mr. Mills’s *Work on Husbandry*, from some objections made to it by the reverend Mr. Comber, we should have altogether neglected, had we not, towards the conclusion, been honoured with particular regard.

Mr. Mills says we have criticised his work in an invidious manner;

ner: but we appeal to the public, whether the character we have given of his two first volumes is not strictly impartial.

He tells us he has been chosen a member of the society of Brittany, of the royal society of agriculture at Paris, and of the society of agriculture and arts at Berne. We have only on this occasion to observe, that notwithstanding the honours conferred on him, no person who has read the Memoirs of the society of Brittany can affirm they are judges of agriculture? Can any one behold such extensive tracts of the finest land in Europe lying uncultivated in the Orleannois, at no great distance from Paris, and at the same time think that the Parisian society fulfils the end of its institution? In praising Mr. Mills's publication, they reflected a large share of honour on their worthy member du Hamel, whose works make so conspicuous a figure in the Treatise on Husbandry.

Mr. Mills informs the public, that M. Lullin de Chateauvieux has, in a letter to a merchant in London, called his performance *Un ouvrage infiniment estimable*. This we readily believe; but then it is kind of self-praise: Mr. Mills was made the medium through which M. Lullin might reflect praise on M. de Chateauvieux. Our readers will readily conceive our meaning, when they recollect that the experiments made by the last mentioned gentleman fill up a large space in Mr. Mills's performance. But enough on this head.

We recommend to our country-gentlemen the perusal of number XXXI. which follows Mr. Mills's letter, on the subject of raising pine apples, and contains an estimate of the expence of building a stove, and the annual charge of a pinery.

Number XLIII. is the copy of a curious old MS. containing an account, delivered by Queen Elizabeth's cofferer, of the expences in a year of her majesty's diet, and that of all her court; in which there appears to have been great hospitality and plenty, yet the whole annual expence amounted only to 1843 *l.* 15 *s.* though there were fifty tables kept besides her majesty's.

Number LVII. treats of the culture of teazel, which is worth attention. Number LXV. describes a machine for cleaning fallows (accompanied by a plate) invented by Mr. Aaron Ogden, of Ashton Underline in Lancashire. The invention is ingenious, but we fear the machine will not answer when brought in practice. Number LXXIV. comprehends a comparison of the profits arising from arable and pasture land near Bury, in Suffolk. The writer of this piece is a very valuable correspondent to the work, as all his letters are on useful practical subjects.

Number LXXXIX provides a remedy for the fly and scab in sheep, which we shall insert for the benefit of our readers.

‘ You



\* You must not be surprised when I say, what will destroy the fly, will also cure the scab, with little or no alterations: mercury is a mortal foe to both; and the remedy for the fly is as follows.

\* Take of good corrosive sublimate, half an ounce; dissolve it in two quarts of rain water; to which add a gill of spirits of turpentine: this is the whole of it, which must be used in the following manner.

\* When the sheep is struck, the shepherd must make a circle round the maggots with some of the water, by dropping it out of a bottle: this prevents them getting away, for they will not come near the water: then he must shred or open the wool within the circle, and drop a few drops of water amongst them, and rub them about with his finger, and there leave them, for they will all die presently.

\* I speak this from my own certain knowledge, and many others in this part of the country can do the same.

\* To a quart of the above water I add a pint of the simple lime-water of the London dispensatory; and I declare it from experience, there is no more certain cure for the scab than it: I am sure it is the cleanest, the soonest prepared, and, when so, the cheapest; which are inducements, I think, sufficient to have every countryman make use of it.

In number XCV is a simple method for preventing the smut in wheat, which consists only in washing the seed well before it is sown.

In the volume now before us, some letters should be particularly distinguished, of which kind we shall first mention three signed E. S. and dated in Middlesex. These are numbers XII, XXXVIII. and LXVIII. and are all on the subject of the drill husbandry. We earnestly recommend them to our readers attention, particularly the last, which contains an account of nineteen or twenty crops of wheat having been got in the same field in little more than twenty years, by practising Mr. Tull's method of husbandry.

We must next take notice of some letters from an old Essex farmer on the subject of chalking land; in the first of which, number XLVIII. is a curious and useful discovery, relative to the subsidence of chalk, and the manner of recovering it after the land is seemingly worn out. This letter is perhaps the best and most useful that has been for many years published on the subject of agriculture; and, if universally read with due attention, might possibly prove of infinite service to land owners, as well as tenants by lease. The other two pieces, written by the same farmer, numbers XCIII. and XCIV. are only in support of the author's system; but they are useful in corroborating his

his former assertions. These three letters abound with philosophical reasonings, and may serve to set the naturalist or chemist to work, to discover in what manner chalk operates in vegetation, when, after having subsided, it may be again brought to the surface in full possession of its original virtues, seeming in this respect to partake of the qualities of antimony or mercury.

Though there are many other papers in this volume deserving of our notice, yet we shall only mention one more letter, inserted in number LXX. signed W. A. S. and dated from Edinburgh: it is sensible and ingenious, containing some remarks on staining elm boards of a mahogany colour; but our principal reason for mentioning this piece is, because, if we remember right, it is the only letter in all the three volumes of this work, written by a North Briton. We are the more surprized at this, as we know the North British farmers and manufacturers are rather more capable of writing properly on the subjects of their vocations, than those of the same rank in England; and that for this plain reason, because education is acquired at a much cheaper rate there than here. They cannot want matter to write on, as numberless improvements have been made within these twenty years in the agriculture of Scotland, and their manufactures are raising above mediocrity; witness the manufactories for cambric or Scotch lawn, and for haberdasheries, established in various parts; the gauze manufactory at Paisley near Glasgow; and particularly the sail-cloth and thread manufactories established at Montrose and other parts, which are of late years brought to such perfection, that the owners are under articles to send to London all they can produce. Such subjects would nobly employ the pen of a North Briton; and we imagine it would prove of no disservice to the manufactories, if an account of their progress was published in a series of letters, addressed to the editors of the *Museum Rusticum*.

As we have no farther remarks to make on this volume, the contents of which we think very valuable and interesting, we shall conclude the article with a wish, that agriculture, on which the present, as well as future prosperity of the British empire so much depends, may continue to improve, till it shall attain that summit of perfection, which will render us a rich and independent people.

---

*N. Original Papers relating to the Disturbances in Bengal; containing every material Transaction from 1759 to 1764. 2 Vols. Pr. 7 s. Newbery.*

**W**E have often had occasion to review the history of the English affairs in Indostan, or as it is commonly called the East-Indies (see vol. xv. p. 302. vol. xvi. p. 249.) and Mr. Scrafton's



Scrafton's work has brought down the accounts of those transactions to the period where the papers before us commence. Before we proceed in reviewing them, we are to put our reader upon his guard against sounds and words. The term of *original* conveys no degree of truth, far less infallibility, to the contents of a paper. All we gather from those before us is, that some gentlemen in the East-Indies proceeded upon a certain plan of measures, and the originality of the papers does no more than authenticate the identity of that plan and those measures; but whether they were consistent with the interest and honour of the mother-country (for we are perhaps not singular in thinking, that the interest of England and the East-India company, and likewise of that company and its agents, are very different considerations) must be left to the judgment of the reader.

The opportunities we had of reviewing many curious pieces, published during some late scrambles for power in the East-India company (see vol. xvii. p. 146, 147, 149, 151, 155, &c.) will greatly contract our labour upon the publication before us. In the course of those reviews many opportunities presented to justify our scepticism with regard to *original* East-India papers; and as a proof of this, we need only put our readers in mind, that certain gentlemen of great and unimpeached credit wrote an original letter addressed to the East-India directors, in which they affirmed that major Carnac gained a complete victory over the Mogul, after a famous battle comparable to that of Porus with Alexander the Great. Mr. President Holwell, on the other hand, who is likewise a gentleman of great and unimpeached credit, denies (*ibid.* p. 231) that such a battle was ever fought, or that a single musket was fired on the occasion. Notwithstanding this and many other discouragements we have met with in East-India publications, that before us is a valuable present to the public, (though we have already reviewed many of the pieces, it contains) because we are thereby enabled to form a connected series of the latest transactions that have come to our hands from that country, as represented by *one side of the question*.

One Mr. John Surman and Kanja Sirhud, agents for the English East-India company in the year 1716, obtained from king (or the Mogul) Furruckseer a phirmaund or grant to the company, confirming all prior grants, and exempting the English from payment of customs and duties on their imports and exports. Orders were given at the same time for the magistrates of the country, to support the English in their *just* concerns. According to this editor, no new privileges of trade were granted by the treaty which was made with Meer Jaffer, by admiral Watson and colonel Clive; but it confirmed the articles agreed

on before with Serajah Doula. It perhaps would have given some satisfaction to an inquisitive reader, if those articles had been here inserted. From the complexion of the papers before us, and indeed from the whole tenor of Mr. Vansittart's government, it appears as if great encroachments had been made by the company's servants, upon the undoubted rights of the Indostan government (ibid. p. 233, 300.) particularly in the articles of salt and betel-nut, which the Moguls and their substitutes had always reserved to themselves; nor could any of the company's servants engage in the salt trade without the Nabob's special licence.

Upon the arrival of Mr. Vansittart at Bengal, he found the affairs of the company in great disorder, chiefly through the mismanagement of Jaffier Aly Cawn, whom the English had made nabob, and his ministers. They neither paid their own troops, nor fulfilled their stipulations with the English, who were their auxiliaries. The Shah Zada, (who by the bye appears to be the true heir to the crown of Indostan) was within thirty miles, and upon the death of the nabob Miran (eldest son and the sole hope of the nabob Jaffier) who is said to have been killed by lightning, every thing went into such disorder, that a general plunder was expected, through the uneasiness of his troops for want of pay. They refused to march; the nabob's treasury, as well as that of the company, was exhausted; (for, to say the truth, the latter seems to have depended on the former) and a stop was put to the company's investment. The servants of the company, it seems, had demanded a mortgage upon certain countries, instead of the assignments that had been given them; but the nabob told them that those revenues were pre-engaged for the use of his own family. It appears by a letter from one colonel Caillaud, that the very servants to the servants of the company, were the directors of this great prince, the nabob, who has been represented as possessing a revenue of above two millions and a half a year. 'The nabob's usage to me, (says Caillaud) in the course of this affair, hath piqued me sensibly, nor will I let it go unnoticed.'

In the mean while the famous Cossin Aly Cawn became a mighty favourite with the English, for having put a stop to a mutiny of the Seapoys in Jaffier's service, by paying part of their demands out of his own treasury; and here we think is the great hinge upon which our narrative turns. Those high and mighty servants found out this same Cossin Aly Cawn to be a sly cunning fellow; and that, though he was the nabob's son-in-law, he would be very glad to fill his place. They felt the nabob's pulse, and recommended Cossin to him in  
the



the strongest terms; but in a letter from the nabob to Mr. Howell, dated the 10th of July 1760, it appears that he had preferred the Chuta nabob's son to succeed his father. About this time Pondicherry was invested; and on the 28th of July 1760 the select committee at Calcutta acquainted the president and council of fort St. George, that for want of money they could give them no manner of assistance for carrying on the siege or blockade. The affairs of the nabob at his capital of Moorshedabad went from bad to worse; and it seems pretty plain, from the letters before us, that the nabob's subjects depended on the English for protection in all their outrages; and that the servants of the company had taken a resolution, that Jaffier should now become a needy, despicable, bloody tyrant. Mr. Vansittart, however, was for continuing him in the government; nay, for guarantying the possession of it to him, in case a treaty with the Shah Zada should take place, but upon the modest terms of his putting into the hands of the *company's servants*, estates to the value of 750,000 l. a year.

We cannot here help pausing upon this demand, as it may reasonably be supposed, that such a rent given without account, might to the factory be worth the round million, and 250,000 l. a year was surely a very moderate allowance for stewardship and collection; for it does not at all appear, that they were obliged to account to the company at home for more than the 750,000 l. Meer Jaffier, barbarian as he was, saw the drift of their high mightinesses, and shewed sensible marks of resentment at their pretending to make him their milch-cow. *Hinc mali labes*, and we find a copy of a memorial (but by whom drawn up, or how authenticated, does not appear) by which Jaffier is represented as a monster of inhumanity, and of having murdered the first grandees in his government, with five of the princesses, wives, daughters or relations of his predecessors, who were all of them massacred or drowned in one night, with about seventy female attendants. Surely, gentle reader! thou canst have no idea, that our high and mighty nabob-makers would continue such a monster of blood in his government, as long as so virtuous and so disinterested a relation as Coffein was ready to relieve him. Jaffier, according to the same paper, was as foolish as he was tyrannical; and the memorial, towards the close of it, appears to be penned by the very persons who had undertaken (see vol. xvii. p. 149) to displace Jaffier, and to substitute Coffein in his place (ibid. p. 150.)

In the course of those letters, Jaffier is accused of having entered into a secret negotiation with the Dutch, for transporting hoops from Batavia into those provinces; and of his being pusillanimous, irregular, and of giving contradictory orders to his

his general. He is said to have attempted to negotiate a separate treaty with the Shah Zada, and of having obstructed the collection of the company's appointments. Were those charges true; they are by no means surprizing, when we consider the thralldom in which he was held by his makers; and that the rapaciousness of their inland dealings, with their refusal to pay the stated duties upon the most vendible country commodities, created that very inability to discharge his engagements with the English, which in this collection is imputed to him as a capital crime. In the mean while, the negotiation with Cossin was still going on, and Jaffier's distresses multiplying; but the road for Cossin's preferment was smoothing, and he undertook to remedy, not only the distressed state of the company's affairs, but the disorders of the country government. Matters being ripe, the following articles were agreed upon.

First, The nabob Jaffier to continue in possession of his dignities, and all affairs to be transacted in his name.

Second, Cossim Aly to be placed in the administration of the affairs of the provinces, and to have the reversion of the government.

Third, Alliance offensive and defensive.

Fourth, The Europeans and Seapoys of the English army, shall be ready to assist the nabob in the management of all affairs.

Fifth, For all charges of the company, and of the said army, and provisions for the field, &c. the lands of Burdwan, Midnapoor, and Chittagong, shall be assigned.

Sixth, Sillet.

Seventh, Former balances to be paid.

Eighth, Lands of the company and of the government, how far distinct.

Ninth, The respective governments how far independent.

Tenth, Whether *peace or war with the prince*, should be left to future deliberation, but in either case, the present agreement to remain inviolable.

We have in former Reviews (*ibid.* p. 150.) seen the consequences of this treaty, the execution of which was entirely left to Mr. Vansittart and colonel Caillaud. We have fresh lights from this collection, as to the insolence and overbearing manner in which poor Jaffier was forc'd into a private life, and how money arose from his deposition. In a letter from Mr. Vansittart to the select committee, dated October 15th, 1760, from Cossimbazar; he says, that while he was treating with Jaffier to resign, "I described every thing in the worst light I could, in hopes that, by magnifying his difficulties, I might bring him more easily to consent to those measures, which we have resolved

on.



on. This seemed to operate in the manner I could wish." But in the same letter he tells them, that he was resolved at all events to carry his point. This reminds us of the common saying, *Get money, my son, honestly if you can, but get money.* At this time we find there was an insurrection at Patna, where the nabob's soldiery mal-treated their commander Rajebullub for want of pay. The *at all-event* scheme was executed with great punctuality. Mr. Vansittart being apprehensive of three wicked counsellors about the nabob's person, he ordered colonel Caillaud to turn him fairly out of his palace, without any ceremony: which poor Jaffier, seeing no remedy, was obliged to submit to; and he had the favour of retiring as a private person to Calcutta, as he could expect no safety against Cosselin's ambition in any other spot of his dominions.

The company, or rather its servants, were now at the highest pitch of glory and felicity, especially as, according to Mr. Vansittart's letter to the select committee, they had in Cosselin got an ally, whose attachment to the company might be depended on. But we do not perceive this revolution, prosperous as it was, to have been entirely agreeable to some of the company's servants, who thought that the select committee carried things to unjustifiable lengths, without the knowledge and approbation of the whole council; and that the deposition of Jaffier was a stain upon the honour of the company and that of the English nation, especially as Jaffier had been by the court of Delly, which is the supreme tribunal of Indostan, confirmed in his subah or nabobship. This was the opinion of Mr. Amyatt, who seems to have been a very sensible worthy man; and indeed, when we consider his letter upon the subject, the whole proceedings of the deposition seem to have been a mean short-sighted expedient for getting a little money. The select committee endeavoured to vindicate themselves from the reflections of Mr. Amyatt and the other gentlemen: but nothing can be more weak than this paper, which rests upon Holwell's unauthenticated self-authorized representations, and other vague assertions. It never seems to have entered into the heads of the nabob-makers, that every prince, if he can, will be independent, and that the greater Cosselin's abilities were, he was the more dangerous:

It does not even appear that matters succeeded so prosperously as they had predicted. The council ordered major Carnac to assist the new nabob in collecting his revenues, or, in other terms, in getting money for themselves. The major and Cosselin soon quarrelled, because the latter wanted to be independent, and the council took Cosselin's part. Soon after colonel Coote succeeded major Carnac in his command at Patna.

Vol. XIX. April, 1763. T He

He was particularly instructed to support Ramnarain, the Indian governor of Patna, who had been remarkably devoted to the English interest, and to assist the nabob in collecting his revenue. Cosselin quarrelled both with Ramnarain and the colonel, for he complained that they had rendered him no better than a cypher in his own government. The council continuing to side with the nabob, Shah Zada, who seems to have been now recognized as Great Mogul, and who was then in those parts, with the colonel's encouragement, put in for a part of the nabob's revenue, which having accordingly obtained, he departed for Delly. As to Cosselin, he kept up a close correspondence with Mr. Vansittart; but he appears very plainly to have been a poor nominal tool in the hands of his creators: his complaints were bitter, and he demanded Coote's dismissal. The truth is, the colonel seems not to have behaved with the greatest moderation; tho' to do him justice, even by the nabob's account he did not treat that prince much worse than a choleric West Indian would do one of his negroes. It is certain that, upon a very unreasonable surmise, he entered into the nabob's encampment, with horsemen and seapoys, who had pistols in their hands; tho' the colonel declares, that those pistols were not cocked. The Shah Zada himself seems to have been as much dissatisfied with the nabob as the colonel was; for, by a letter from major Carnac, he offered the devannee, which indeed amounted to the subahship of Bengal, to the company. The company rejected this offer, not without some tart reflections upon the major's self-created importance; because their acceptance of it would be a source of continual jealousies between the nabob and the company.

Ramnarain became now obnoxious to the council, on account of some disputes he had with the nabob, who hated him; but he was protected by major Carnac. It is worthy observation, that all Ramnarain's merit, and the great services he had performed to the English, seem to have been now forgotten, because he had not paid the vast sums demanded of him by the nabob, who was to pay it again into the council. As to major Carnac, he writes with the honesty becoming an Englishman; and both he and colonel Coote having orders to repair to Calcutta, and leave the command of the army to captain Carstairs, he says, that he is happy in being removed from the command of an army, that was to be employed on the purposes for which he found it was intended. We cannot but think, from a minute of the third of August, 1761, that Mr. Vansittart was a little fore on this head, and indeed not without reason. Matters between the major and him came to extremities, as the former frankly declared 'that he had rather incur the charge  
of



of disobedience, than comply with orders, the execution whereof would bring dishonour upon the nation, and disgrace upon himself, and the forces under his command.

About this time the direction of the company at London began to make a distinction between the public and private trade of the company, and thought it was for their interest, that their troops should assist the nabob in forcing the zemindars, or great landholders, to pay their contributions. The reason of this is obvious; but some of the council, Mr. Amyatt in particular, had a very indifferent opinion of the nabob, and thought it was dishonourable for the company's military servants to be under his direction, as it must be according to the instructions given to Mr. Ellis, who was appointed to be chief at Patna, and to superintend captain Carstairs. The instructions, however, seemed to have been approved of. The violent behaviour of Mr. Ellis, in ordering captain Carstairs to arrest some of the nabob's subjects and officers, was, and perhaps with some reason, highly resented by Colsein, who represented, that his interests and the company's were united. Mr. Ellis seems not to have understood such a scheme of policy; but the reader of this collection may easily perceive its meaning; and indeed the wantonness of those imprisonments laid but too justifiable a foundation for Colsein's resentment. The executive power was lodged in the hands of the company's servants, who not only carried on trade for themselves, but protected the natives in doing the same, without paying a shilling towards the nabob's revenue, without which it was absolutely impossible for him to fulfil his engagements with the company. This cannot be better explained, than by a quotation from the contents of the papers before us.

The person mentioned in Mr. Ellis's letter to have been sent a prisoner to Calcutta, was an officer of the nabob's—his name was Coja Antoon—he had been accused of purchasing five maunds of salt-petre: to answer for this crime, he was sent 900 miles, and after a confinement of three months, was delivered over to farther punishment. Another charge against this person was, that he had given a certificate of some goods having been duly paid, which was a contempt of the company's duty. Distinction between the trade of the company, and the concerns of private merchants—every struggle made by the country people against the oppressions and extortions of the *private English Gomastahs trade*, was immediately construed as an attack upon the company's rights.

Some other very hasty measures were pursued by Mr. Ellis. Upon a false information he searched the fort of Mongheer for two deserters, than which there could not be a greater insult

offered to the nabob's government; and he even ordered a company of seapoys to lye before the fort for three months, till the nabob gave orders for admitting a lieutenant, two seapoys, and a serjeant, who searched the fort, but could find no deserters. Those, and many other violences, occasioned Coffein's enemies to have a vast disregard for his person; and they more than once conspired against his life; but being detected, were tried before an assembly of the people, who sentenced them to death. Mr. Vansittart, the president, was all this while extremely uneasy, but behaved with great moderation, to prevent any rupture between the nabob and the company. Mr. Hastings was sent with instructions to Coffein with that view; but a motion was made by Mr. Amyatt, to ingraft on these instructions to Mr. Hastings, a demand to be made on the nabob for twenty lacks of rupees\*, which he had formerly, after his accession, offered the governor and the members of the select committee, and which they had refused.—The paper or bond, containing the offer of this sum, was returned to the nabob by the president, the moment he knew the contents of it.—The gentlemen of the select committee intirely approved of the president's refusal of the offer; but it was now moved, that the money should be demanded of the nabob, “And in case he refuses payment on account of the bond's being returned, that he should be made to understand, that it was returned without proper authority.”

This was a trying point; and major Carnac being unconstitutionally called to the board on the occasion, the majority agreed to make the demand, though Mr. Vansittart protested against it in the strongest manner. Mr. Hastings, upon his arrival at Patna, found the nabob highly disgusted with the demand he made, but well disposed towards Mr. Vansittart and the company. The reader is to remember, that, at this time, the œconomy which Coffein had introduced into his finances, had enabled him punctually not only to fulfil all his engagements with the company, but to make them a present of 62500*l.* without being a shilling in debt. It appears likewise, that he perfectly well understood the constitution of the company in India, and that he made a proper distinction between the proceedings of the company and those of Mr. Ellis. During these transactions, a full approbation came from the company of the revolution which had happened in the nabobship. The disputes between the nabob and Mr. Ellis still continued; and at last, the whole came out to be founded upon the right which the servants of the company claimed, to carry on a private trade distinct from that of the company.

[ *To be concluded in our next.* ]

---

\* A lack of rupees is worth about 12,500*l.*



VI. *A Dissertation on the Inutility of the Amputation of Limbs. Written in Latin, by M. Bilguer, Surgeon General to the Armies of the King of Prussia. Augmented with the Notes of Mr. Tissot, Physician at Lusanne. Now first translated into English by a Surgeon. 8vo. Pr. 2s. 6d. Baldwin.*

**M.** BILGUER published this dissertation in Latin for a degree in physic. M. Tissot thought the piece so valuable, that, though much hurried with business, yet, finding no other person undertake the task, he himself translated it into French, to which he added many useful notes of his own.

The author endeavours to prove in this pamphlet, the inutility of amputations in most of the cases in which it is at present practised. The cases wherein amputation has been deemed necessary, he reduces to six :

‘ First, A mortification, which spreads till it reaches the bone.

‘ Secondly, Any limb so greatly hurt, whether by fracture or dilaceration, that there is room to dread the most fatal consequences, a mortification and death.

‘ Thirdly, A violent contusion of the soft parts, which has at the same time shattered the bones.

‘ Fourthly, Wounds of the larger vessels, which convey the blood into the limb, either, as the only means of stopping the hemorrhage, or through the apprehension the limb should perish for want of nourishment.

‘ Fifthly, An incurable caries of the bones.

‘ Sixthly, If any part is either attacked with a cancer, or is in danger of being so, it is customary to take it off.’

In the first case, when a mortification attacks any part, from whatever cause, our author makes deep and long incisions on the parts mortified, and those adjacent, taking care of the direction of the great blood-vessels, nerves, and muscles. In the muscles, the incisions should follow the direction of the greatest number of fibres; but he observes, that if the gastrocnemee or deltoid are wounded by a ball, they must be cut transverse, otherwise convulsions, particularly the spasmus cynicus, will probably ensue.—After this, we must examine carefully, how far the actual mortified part reaches, which he directs to be separated from the sound by incision; taking great care, however, not to cut the nerves, larger blood-vessels, or any sound piece of flesh. If the mortified parts have reached to the bone, he gives the form of a liniment to be applied: dried lint is to be laid above, and a powder of myrrh, sal ammon. camph. and nitre, sprinkled on; different layers of lint and powder

must be laid on till the wound is filled up, The parts about are to be scarified, and sprinkled with the powder; all the fores to be embrocated with oil of turpentine, a light bandage applied, and the whole kept moistened night and day with warm fomentations; of which he gives a variety of forms, generally compounded according to the German manner. These fomentations thus diligently applied, will, he says, in twelve hours, greatly alter the condition of gangrened wounds for the better.—The same dressings are to be renewed every twelve hours: the third or fourth dressing, the wound will discharge favourably, and it will only be necessary to give the bark internally. After this, he dresses the wound with digestive ointment. He takes notice of the bark's having proved of great service to him, in stopping and curing mortifications.

When a mortification arises from an internal morbid cause, amputation can be of no benefit, except the internal cause, as dropsy, &c. be first removed.—When a mortification arises in a healthy constitution, from an external cause, if it is spreading, there is such a fever and inflammation accompanying, that if amputation was to be performed in such a state, life would be in the utmost hazard. Again, we must not amputate on the sound parts near the mortified, as the infection has often reached much higher than could well be imagined. If the rottenness of the bone demonstrate that the limb cannot be saved, amputation must be performed, if the patient has strength, because there is no other remedy.

When there is a large contusion of the limbs, and the bones are extremely bruised and shattered, M. Bilguer advises practitioners not to amputate, but to lay open the parts, extract extraneous bodies and splinters, which come away without violence; but says, that by proper dressings, giving the bark, proper diet, &c. he has cured more than could have been hoped for from amputation.—It is never necessary, he says, to perform amputation for an hæmorrhage; for wherever the artery is situated, by incisions it may be reached, and the bleeding stopped by astringents, &c. Agaric and spirit of turpentine have often succeeded in stopping hæmorrhages; and there is little danger to be apprehended as to the wasting of the limbs, because the anastomising branches will dilate, and furnish, in a little time, a sufficient supply of blood, as we see happens in aneurisms. Our author then enumerates several particular cases of great contusions, fractures penetrating into the joints, entire pieces of the bones taken away, which were successfully cured by his treatment.

When the bone is attacked with a caries, if recent, we should not think of amputation. The bone must be laid bare, and treated



treated by proper perforations, and the application of frankincense, mastic, myrrh, balsam of Peru, &c.—If the caries is very extensive, and accompanied with a bad habit of body, the caries depending on this, amputation would be of no service; but if we can remove the morbid state of the body, we need not despair of a cure of the caries by trepanning, &c.

In the cure of cancers, if the complaint is recent, the constitution good, and if neither internal nor external remedies have proved serviceable, he advises extirpation. But, generally, the disease has gained too much footing when the operation is performed, and thus it rather hastens the patient's death. From the conclusion of this section, our author seems to be unacquainted with Dr. Storck's publications.

To conclude: This pamphlet not only contains arguments against amputations of limbs, but also the author's own successful treatment of many cases where others would have employed this operation; and under one or other of these heads will be found the treatment of the far greater number of cases which will fall under a surgeon's hand after a battle; so that it cannot fail of proving very useful in this respect. M. Tissot, the French translator, has added many useful notes, explaining or illustrating the text.

The English translation is, upon the whole, very lame and inaccurate.

---

VII. *An Answer to a Letter to the Reverend Doctor Thomas Leland: Containing, An Examination of the Criticism on a late Dissertation on the Principles of Eloquence. In which is particularly shewn, that the Lord Bishop of Gloucester's Idea of the Character of an Inspired Language, as delivered in his Doctrine of Grace, is acknowledged to be indefensible by the learned Vindicator.* By Thomas Leland, D. D. 4to. Pr. 2s. 6d. Johnston,

**T**HIS controversy gives us a lively idea of a preferment-hunting toad eater. A great prelate, who has many literary qualifications; but, in that part of knowledge which regards genius, is not perhaps the best critic in England, happens to go out of his depth, and while he is sinking, his toad-eater tells him that he is treading good ground; but, at the same time, offers him the use of a cork jacket to keep him above water.

We have already (See Vol. XVIII. P. 328.) declared our opinion, that Dr. Leland, in the dispute between him and the officious letter-writer who pitted himself as the champion for the Right Reverend Prelate, has greatly the advantage in this

controversy : nor can we more fully vindicate the observations we made on the subject of Sublimity, which forms the capital article of dispute in this question, than by transcribing the following passage from the work before us.

‘ The bishop asks, What is Sublimity but the application of such images, as arbitrary or casual connexions, rather than their own native grandeur, have dignified and ennobled ?’—— You say, ‘ I answer this question by asking another, *Whether Sublimity doth necessarily consist in the application of images ?*’—— In justice to myself, I am obliged to remind you, that *this is not my answer.* I have said indeed that such a question *might be asked.* But instead of resting the argument on a matter not unworthy of notice, but not of the utmost moment, I proceed to what I expressly declare is of *more especial moment* to the point in debate ; and that is, to shew, by many arguments and illustrations, that those *images or vivid ideas*, or whatever you are pleased to call them, which critics denominate *sublime*, do not owe their *grandeur*, that is, their power of elevating, affecting, and transporting, to fancy, caprice, casual connections, &c. but have their several degrees of dignity and grandeur, naturally, necessarily, and universally.—Against the force of what I offer upon this head, your argument is this :

“ I maintain that these bright and vivid ideas are rendered *interesting* to the reader or hearer from the influence of Association, rather than *of their own native dignity and grandeur* : of which I could give so many instances, that for this reason, I will only give your *own*, which you lay so much stress upon, of *the famous oath by the souls of those who fought at Marathon and Plataea* : where the peculiar ideas of *interest, glory, and veneration*, associated to the *image or idea* of the battles of *Marathon and Plataea*, gave a sublime and energy to this oath of Demosthenes, *by the souls of those that fought there*, in the conceptions of his countrymen, which no other people could have felt from it, and of which you, Sir, with all your admiration of it, have certainly a very faint conception at this time.”

‘ It will appear to any one who takes the trouble of examining, that, far from *laying any stress* upon this *instance*, I have but mentioned it casually, and made no use or application of it at all to the proof or illustration of the point now before us. However, as you have certainly chosen it very properly and pertinently, I shall not refuse to join issue with you, upon this very instance.

‘ Demosthenes is enforcing the gallant and glorious conduct of his countrymen, in opposing a bold invader of their liberty. “ Shall your unsuccessful valour be condemned ?” exclaims the orator. “ No ! by the souls of those our brave countrymen

who



who fought at *Marathon* and *Platæa*! you have acted nobly." This you say *had a sublime and energy* in the conceptions of his countrymen. And this sublimity you resolve into *the bright and vivid ideas* which are excited. What then were these ideas! *National interest*, you say, and *glory* and *veneration* of their ancestors. And your position is, that these ideas did not owe their influence to a *native grandeur*; that they had no *natural* power of transporting and affecting; but that the emotions which they excited were merely accidental.—Indeed! Examine your own heart, and revolve what you have seen, or heard, or read. Have these species of action which are called *great* and *glorious* in every language, no *natural* influence upon our minds? Is that rapture of love and admiration which they excite, to be resolved into caprice and accident? The very dispute in which we are now engaged, is a direct proof that the interest which we take in the fortune of nations, the transport which we feel from instances of magnanimity and patriot virtue, is *natural* and *universal*. Else why have we ransacked all the records of antiquity? How could we have ever thought or heard of the battles of *Marathon* or *Platæa*? Or how could we be now engaged in a dispute on an allusion to these battles?

‘But you say, that the violent effect which this passage in Demosthenes had upon his hearers arose “from the peculiar ideas of *glory*, *veneration*, &c. being accidentally associated with the idea of the battles of *Marathon* and *Platæa*.”—I shall not enquire whether there was any *natural* connection between the idea of the glorious actions of their countrymen and that of the victories obtained by those actions; I will suppose there was not; and I will suppose, that by the *ideas* of *veneration*, &c. you mean the impression or emotion raised by the *objects* of *veneration*, &c. And is not this impression *naturally* violent and transporting, because the object is presented to the mind by an association of ideas, or any accidental cause? A man is reminded by some casual circumstance of the death of his beloved friend, and bursts into a violent passion of grief. But does it follow from hence, that his agitation is casual or *unnatural*?—That I may adhere to the instance before us, I readily agree, that the image or *idea* of the battle of *Marathon* was strictly connected in the mind of an *Athenian* with *those* of the heroic valour of his ancestors and the glory of his country. But this, far from being the *cause* of that rapture which these latter *ideas* raised in his mind, was really the *effect* of it. For he must have frequently reflected with rapture on the great deeds performed at that particular place, before such a connection had been formed at all.

‘And surely you cannot mean, that the passage in debate amounts

amounts to no more than an incidental mention of the battles of *Marathon* and *Platæa*; which by an association of ideas reminded the hearers of the glorious deeds of former times. The very passage itself is an incontestible evidence against such a supposition. It is a lively expression of that rapture which the speaker himself felt from those ideas of national glory, &c. which he raised in others. He himself appeared to be violently transported, and hence principally the violent effect upon his hearers.

Or if your meaning be, that the image or idea of a particular battle fought at a particular place, hath no native dignity, but affects only by association; it is obvious to observe, that the idea raised by Demosthenes in the minds of his hearers was not barely the idea of a particular battle fought at a particular place. He swears not by the *battle of Marathon*, but by the *souls of those who fought at Marathon*. The idea thus raised was, that of a glorious victory, obtained in a glorious cause by the heroic valour of his countrymen. And the real question is nothing more than this, Whether such an idea be naturally grand and elevating, or no?

“But no other people,” you say, “except the *Athenians*, could have felt the energy of this passage in *Demosthenes*.”—A people strangers to the history of *Athens* could indeed feel no effect from it. A people not immediately interested in the fortune of *Athens*, though no strangers to the exploits of her citizens, could not be so violently affected by it.—Suppose an *English* poet were to introduce an animated invocation of the Spirit of *WOLFE*. It raises a thousand vivid and transporting ideas in his countrymen. A *Prussian*, who knows the history of the late war in *America*, feels some part of this transport, though by no means so violently. A *Frenchman* is affected by the passage in a quite different manner. A *Japonese*, who we will suppose is only acquainted with the words, receives it with absolute insensibility. Does it follow, that this invocation is not really animated; that it owes its power of affecting to caprice or accident; that it amounts to no more than an incidental mention of the battle of *Quebec*; or that it has no real grandeur, because the image or idea of this battle is not naturally and universally grand and transporting? (which by the way is not true of the idea of any battle.) Or that the impression made by the ideas of national glory, patriot virtue, and an heroic contempt of danger, is merely local and accidental? Is not the emotion of grief natural, because *Thomas* is a stranger to the misfortunes of *William*, or *William* not so deeply affected with those of *Robert* as he himself?

As the distance between Dr. Leland and the London press makes



makes it unlikely (if not impossible) for him to have seen our Review of the Letter he answers, at the time of his writing this publication, we are proud of the coincidency of his sentiments with our own. We cannot, however, help thinking that he has made too modest an use of his victory. — Sensations arising merely from local circumstances, are not characteristic of a generous mind, which feels the battle of Marathon in every battle fought for the liberties of mankind; and an Englishman is affected by a Demosthenes speaking of his countrymen's victory at Marathon, with almost the same sensation as he would a Raleigh describing the defeat of a Spanish armada. French critics, it is true, have found out a wonderful propriety in local subjects for the Epic, and of late for the Drama; but the effect of the sublime is independent of all considerations, except that simplicity which the God of nature gives to happy genius.

The doctor in this answer has established an unanswerable superiority over his antagonist, who, if he has any feeling, must be more sensibly affected by the rational, yet temperate, manner in which this answer is penned, than if Dr. Leland had launched out in all the swelling superciliousness established dignity assumes over modest learning.

---

VIII. *The Morality of the New Testament, digested under various Heads, comprehending the Duties which we owe to God, to ourselves, and to our Fellow-creatures. With an Introduction addressed to Deists; in which the Character of Jesus Christ is vindicated against the Aspersions of modern Unbelievers; and also an Attempt is made to prove, that the Religion taught by Jesus Christ was the pure Religion of Nature and of Reason. The whole concluding with Observations on a late Treatise, intitled, The Doctrine of Grace, written by Dr. Warburton, Bishop of Gloucester, together with an Enquiry, how far the Belief of any Doctrine may be necessary to Salvation; and some Observations on the Arguments of Mr. Locke and Dr. Leland, By a Rational Christian. 4to. Pr. 10s. 6d. Johnston.*

A Friend of the author, or the author himself, who has written a preface to this most excellent tract, as he is pleased to stile it, informs us that 'the design of it, is, to separate and distinguish between pure and simple Christianity, or Christian morality, as it was taught by its great author; and the adulterated, sophisticated, clerical Christianity, which hath prevailed in Christendom, and which hath elbowed and jostled the Christianity of Jesus Christ almost out of the world.' Our author, he tells

tells us, hath endeavoured to shew, that the true sterling coin of Jesus Christ has been adulterated by artful men, and that their *brass* hath been palmed upon the world, and passed with the vulgar for pure gold; that superstition and foolish rites and ceremonies have been substituted in the room of pure morality, true virtue, and genuine religion.

The author has laboured, he says, to purge Christianity from its base mixture, to refine the mass, to separate the pure gold from the dross with which it is alloyed, to shew it in its native excellency and lustre, and to demonstrate how worthy it is of our regard and admiration, when cleansed from the dregs with which it is crusted round, and under which it has been long buried. Pure Christianity is a beauty which hath been dressed up in the filthy rags of human invention, so that none of her native charms could be seen unless by the penetrating and curious eye. She has been so masked and disguised by those who have pretended to recommend her to the world, that she has rather appeared a whore of Babylon than a daughter of the skies: our author has stripped her of the ridiculous tinsel trappings with which she has been covered, and made her appear *simplex munditiis*,—the character of a true beauty, capable by her genuine simple charms, of attracting the admiration of all men of true taste and genius. *Peace on earth, good-will to men, the love of God and of our neighbour, universal charity and benevolence, and the doing to others as we would they should do unto us*, is the summary of the religion of Jesus. How short and full her apothegms! how sweet and enchanting the voice of pure and genuine Christianity! Good God! what have we got in its stead! . . . If Jesus Christ was to return into the world, and to search the records of priests for his religion, he could not know it again.

Christianity, we confess, like its divine author, has been dressed up, by bigots and enthusiasts, in a ridiculous attire, and under that disguise exposed to derision; but this writer, when he attempts to strip off her mask, and display her genuine graces, robs her of her distinguished characteristics, tears away the lineaments of her divinity, and leaves a skeleton in the room of that heavenly beauty, which he pretends to exhibit in her original form.

For, according to his representation, 'Jesus Christ is only a wise and virtuous man. It was not, he thinks, necessary for him to produce a commission immediately from God to claim the regard and attention of mankind, seeing that what he taught them was plain and clear, and had a natural tendency to promote their happiness.'



His religion is a mere system of morals. 'The *moral* doctrines and precepts of Christ and his Apostles, appear to me to be a fair and perfect transcript of natural religion, and therefore I stile *these* and *these* only, the religion of Christ or Christianity.' . . . 'The *moral* parts of the New Testament are those only which can concern mankind. . . . Nature and conscience dictate and discover to us the relations we stand in to God, and to our fellow-creatures; and reason points out the duties which flow from these relations. . . . If there are any other relations or any other duties, I confess I am unacquainted with them: I think there can be no other; and I also think that *these* are clearly discoverable by the light of nature only; and that a *supernatural revelation* is a manifest contradiction. . . . The first converts, or disciples, called themselves Christians, as a mark of their gratitude to Christ, the founder of this, according to them, *new* religion; agreeable to a common practice among the disciples of philosophers in those days, of calling themselves after the names of their masters. Nor do I find any other reason for denominating the religion taught by Christ, the Christian religion. However his system, I mean all of it that may fairly be called his own, appears to me to be no other than the religion of nature and reason republished; that religion which God had originally implanted in the minds of his intelligent creatures, and which the wise men in all ages constantly practised.'

Our author pays no attention to the prophecies which foretold our Saviour's appearance, the miracles and predictions which evinced his divine legation, the exalted character which he sustained, and will always sustain in the Christian dispensation; the institution which was designed to keep up the remembrance of an important fact; the *evangelical* discoveries of a future world; and other points of this nature. These things, we presume, he includes among the articles of superstition, enthusiasm, bigotry, and priest-craft, against which he incessantly declaims.

'The religion of nature, he says, can admit of no improvement, no other can be so perfect and complete in all its parts, or so well adapted to promote the happiness of mankind: its maxims must be allowed by all, if they deliberate a moment, and consider who was their author. What can be more perfect than the law of God? who, besides the Maker of the universe, can be so capable of framing laws fit to govern it? Who can so well know the wants and necessities of mankind as God, whose omniscient eye penetrates all nature? How easy must it have been for that infinitely wise Being, who made all things, to make laws which would always answer the purposes of his govern-

government? It is indeed a degree of blasphemy to say, that he could not do this, or that his laws should ever stand in need of alteration or amendment.

We readily allow the excellency of the laws of God; but when they are only written, as our author says, 'in the hearts of intelligent creatures,' how liable are they to be obliterated or misconstrued! The law of nature is only what men are capable of discerning by their natural faculties, and can be no more perfect than human reason. It cannot possibly comprehend all that is included in the nature of things. There are many articles of *great importance* to mankind, which vitiated reason could have never determined with any precision; and therefore an *express revelation* from God became expedient.

The circumstances of mankind under this dispensation, must be very different from what they were in the beginning, and from these different circumstances different duties necessarily result. Above all, the divine authority of the messenger, who is employed in the redemption of mankind, and produces his credentials for that purpose, must be considered and acknowledged.

Mr. Locke, in his *Treatise on the Reasonableness of Christianity*, has insisted upon the necessity of believing that Jesus was the Messiah, who had been promised by God to the world.

Our author dislikes this notion, and exclaims, 'how wretched then are those who have heard the preaching of the Gospel, and yet, after the best use of their faculties, in an honest and impartial enquiry, cannot believe' what the New Testament asserts concerning the Messiah! 'According to the whole tenor of Mr. Locke's discourse, their sincerity, their good works, will avail them nothing; and the best they are to expect from their merciful Father, is eternal death.'

When Jesus Christ came to convert mankind from their errors and vices, and evidently proved that he was the authorised legislator of heaven, the belief of that point was certainly a duty, and the disbelief of it a vice; as the one was the result of a laudable disposition, the ground of their conversion and adherence to his laws; the other, an indication of wilful negligence, vitious prejudices, and a contempt of religion. Our author therefore misrepresents Mr. Locke, and talks absurdly, when he pretends, that he puts their sincerity in opposition to their faith.

But just representations of men and things are not the distinguishing characteristics of this performance. Dr. Sykes, in his *Essay on the truth of the Christian religion*, wished, "that Christians would not vend, under the name of evangelical truth, the absurd and contradictory schemes of ignorant and wicked men;



men; that they would part with that load of rubbish which makes thinking men almost sink under the weight, and gives too great a handle for infidelity." Our author produces this observation as a proof that the Doctor was of his opinion, in supposing that what is called the religion of Christ, over and above his moral doctrines and precepts, is entirely useless, and mere rubbish; but we are amazed at this impudent insinuation; for that worthy and judicious divine had no such thoughts; he made it the business of his life to examine and discover the genuine sense and meaning of all the sacred writers on those points of doctrine which our author promiscuously rejects.

If he exploded the common notion of predestination, propitiation, &c. he did not explode those parts of scripture which the authors of those doctrines had mistaken, but he endeavoured to explain them in a rational and consistent manner. Our author, on the contrary, "rejects every thing which (to his apprehension) is mysterious, unintelligible, or absurd, as interpolation, corruption, imposition, and forgery; and comprises the whole system of Christianity under the moral doctrines of the New Testament—because he understands no other.

If priests, he says, were to assert only the moral doctrines of the New Testament; and if they would give up those things which reason cannot approve, because they cannot be comprehended by it, they would then meet with very little trouble or opposition from any quarter.

I contend only for the moral parts of the New Testament, nor shall I endeavour to account for the introduction of those other parts which are blended with them. . . . I leave the latter to those, who, without understanding them, still make them a part of their religion, and I heartily recommend such persons to the care of their spiritual guides.

If any considerable degree of learning had seemed to me necessary to this end, I should never have undertaken it: but pure morality will always be on the level with common sense. The unlearned are as much concerned in it as the learned. It is the same in all languages, in all places, and at all times: the practice of it is required universally without distinction; and therefore all paraphrases, all commentaries, all explanations of the scripture would be superfluous and unnecessary, if the moral parts only were regarded. Indeed it appears to me that a rule given for universal use, by a Being of infinite wisdom, can never want explanation.

Our author, consistently with this opinion, should have maintained that Christianity ought to have been delivered in a language consisting of words and phrases, which all capacities, in all nations and all ages, might have understood invariably, without any kind of instruction.

The

The author proceeds : ' The law of nature is universally understood, so far as to constitute a rule " perfect in it's direction for the conduct of human life," and is therefore of universal and eternal obligation.

' I am in a particular manner willing to convince you Deists \*, how very improper and absurd it is for you to ridicule and depreciate the character of Him, who lost his life in the cause of virtue and true religion. The religion of Christ, unadulterated, is pure morality : now the practice of morality has a direct tendency to promote the happiness of society, by making better fathers, better husbands, better wives, better children, better servants, better subjects, better masters ; in short, a strict attachment to it will exalt human nature to that glorious height, which God the maker of the world, intended it should attain. You cannot, upon your own principles, be enemies to morality. You believe there was such a person as Jesus Christ, and that he taught morality to mankind ; nay, some of you have gone so far as to say, that you believed him to have been a Deist. How inconsistent then is it, for you to endeavour to depreciate his character !'

Upon our author's principles, it would indeed be very unreasonable in the Deists to endeavour to depreciate the character of Christ ; for what character can they possibly leave him below that of a wise and virtuous moralist !

The author has divided his work into four books. The first contains the duties which we owe to God ; the second, the duties which we owe to ourselves ; the third, the duties which we owe to our fellow-creatures ; and the fourth, sundry general articles, viz. happiness, good works, repentance, religion, &c. Each book is sub-divided into chapters, to which he has prefixed some passages from the New Testament, applicable to his subject.

His intention, he says, ' is to reconcile all contending parties, by proving the morality of the New Testament to be a transcript of the law of nature ; and by demonstrating it to be a system of *morals* worthy of having God for its author, worthy of having Christ for its republisher, and worthy of the regard of every rational being.'

In this part of his work the reader will find several observations worthy of his attention.

In his chapter on equity he speaks with proper indignation (which indeed we expect in writers of his principles) against persecution, on account of mistaken opinions in matters of religion.

---

\* The introduction from which this paragraph is taken, is an address to the Deists.



\* Would to God, says he, that all those in power, both in church and state, would ever remember, that God has reserved to himself the knowledge and judgment of the human heart, and that he cannot be pleased with having his authority usurped. One would think that the judges of the earth should tremble when they pronounce sentence on their brethren, in things of which God alone can judge. How irrational and unchristian is it, for the rulers of our church to influence and add weight to the arm of civil power in the invasion of the rights of conscience; instead of following the example of Christ and his apostles! How absurd, that they should copy from the inquisition, and substitute corporal punishments in the room of reason and instruction! This is not acting like rational beings, but like beasts, who, having no arguments to support their cause, recur to force.

\* Conscience is a steady friend to truth, or at least to what appears to be true. No bodily punishments can alter, or lessen this attachment. Reason may convince a man of his error, but the punishment of his body hath no such tendency.

\* Persecution is the bane of truth and sincerity. It never informs or convinces the judgment, but will always tend to establish hypocrisy, ignorance, and superstition; and therefore is absurd, uncharitable, and diabolical.

\* After all, if the most excellent precept of nature, and of Christ, Matth. vii. 12. which is the subject of this article, will not prevent persecution, surely nothing can.

\* Tell me, you who persecute and ill treat such as differ from you in religious opinions; tell me, whether this rule be written in your hearts? and farther, tell me, whether that can be a good religion, which tolerates persecution?—Surely there cannot be a stronger mark of a bad one.

\* If you apprehend a man's opinion to be erroneous, you are taught by your great master to restore him in the spirit of meekness; by reason and argument, and not by punishment: the one may cure, the other confirm his errors.

\* The friends of virtue and true religion can never be the friends of persecution: it always injures and weakens the cause of virtue, and establishes hypocrisy and superstition on the ruins of true religion.

\* Reason obliges us to conform to the laws of virtue: now the laws of virtue are conformable to the divine will. Nature

---

\* The good bishop of Cambray observes, that liberty of thinking is an impregnable fortress which cannot be overcome; and that force may make hypocrites, but can never make profelytes.

and reason, as well as christianity, teach us, that it is the immutable will of God that his creatures should be happy. Where then can an excuse for persecution be found? Not in reason, not in nature, not in christianity, or at least in that which I conceive to be christianity. It is directly opposite to the will of God, and therefore is diabolical; having, as Dr. Warburton says, the mark of the beast.

The conclusion contains some observations on what *this writer* calls the *mysterious* parts of the New Testament, in the course of which he endeavours to shew, that they are the adulterations of frailty and fraud; that many human errors have been blended with divine truths; that pure morality, or the religion of nature, wanted no inspiration but such as Job says, ch. xxxii. 8. every rational man is possessed of; and that the New Testament, take it altogether, as it appears in our language, can hardly, with propriety, be stiled the word of God. He produces some instances in confirmation of this opinion, which are stale and trite objections; and only serve to convince the intelligent reader, that the cavils of deistical writers generally arise from mistakes; and that the mysteries, against which they exclaim, are either *antiquated* notions, or the illusions of their own understanding.

Our author, however, applauds himself on the merit of his performance and the integrity of his design. 'I have endeavoured, says he, for the honour of Christianity, to divest it of the mask with which bigotry and enthusiasm have disguised it, and to defend it on principles of *reason*, its best and surest defence.

'I have laboured to prove, and I hope have proved, that the religion taught by Christ \* and his apostles was the religion of nature; and that it is consonant to reason and to our most approved conception of the divine nature.

'I reverence the character of Christ and endeavour to practise his precepts, because my conscience tells me that they are reasonable, natural, and productive of human felicity, and for this reason I denominate myself a rational Christian.'

In an appendix the author endeavours to prove, that the doctrine of a future state of retribution is not *peculiar* to Christianity, but a part of the primitive religion, revealed by God himself to mankind. He deduces his arguments from our natural notions of God and his attributes, the natural feelings and desires of mankind, and that knowledge of it which the sages of antiquity had, long before the appearance of Christ in the world.

---

\* By the religion of Christ he desires the reader would understand that he always means, his *moral* doctrines and precepts.



We readily grant that the presumption of a future state was very great and general among mankind before the appearance of Christ; but surely the conjectures of philosophers, and the fictions of poets, are not to be compared with the discoveries of the Gospel; in which Jesus Christ, whose divine character leaves us no room to question his knowledge and veracity, teaches and illustrates this important article, and demonstrates the truth of his assertions by his own resurrection from the dead: which all together seems to be the highest evidence of an invisible world that mankind can possibly receive.

IX. *The Political Balance. In which the Principles and Conduct of the two Parties are weighed. 8vo. Pr. 1s. Becket.*

THE author of this masterly performance considers the two parties he treats of, with respect to their principles of government, to their system of foreign policy, and to their domestic administration. He begins his comparison from the time at which the two parties assumed their present form, and which comprehends the transactions of the summer of 1763, and the following winter. He observes, that his present majesty, at the time of his accession, found neither danger nor difficulty from the secession of the heads of the former ministry, rooted as they were in the possession of power for almost half a century.

But, proceeds this author, 'It is certain that a very different scene presented itself at the time this pamphlet begins its review. The frequent transitions of the ministerial power had the necessary consequence of weakening the strength of the government, and that reputation for firmness which is one of its surest supports.

It was at the close of the session of 1763, that the care of the public business in the House of Commons devolved upon Mr. Grenville; and from that time he seems to have stood in the House of Commons, at the head of one of the two parties which it is proposed to compare.

But notwithstanding the character of this minister for constitutional knowledge and unblemished integrity; and notwithstanding the reputation he had acquired to himself, and the facilities which he had given to government, while he had been entrusted with the conduct of the K——'s business, he could not immediately expect an extensive support.

His administration was liable to two objections, which being contradictory could not both be true; but had however much weight in the minds of those who formed them.

The retiring minister (said the partizans of the late secretary)

ary) shall not find it easier to exercise his power under the sanction of another name, than he did to retain it in his own; nor will the vigour of the opposition be so much abated by this preference of change, as excited by the insult which it offers to their understandings.

We were attached, said another knot of men, by the bands of friendship and gratitude to the person of the earl, into whose councils we could enter, and of whose favour we were assured; a new minister rises on the ruin of our protector, who will not pursue his measures, who cannot promote his friends; can it be prudent to range ourselves on the side of one, to whom we are not bound by the ties of gratitude, scarcely by those of hope?

Even the more sober and disinterested part of the nation made some pause; the minds of honest men do not form, lightly and suddenly, with different men and upon different plans, connections of a delicate and important nature: nor could they be assured (and this uncertainty retained many) that this system would be more lasting than those which they had seen successively formed and dissolved.

On the other hand, this new frame had now in the course of four months begun to knit, and to gain strength; when a new plan almost dislocated it; and if it had been pursued in the extent which was demanded by the opposition, there would not I think have remained even to the Crown the power of altering the administration; at least during the lives of the confederated chiefs.

When this plan was found dangerous and impracticable, and the government resettled upon its former bottom; it was foreseen that this event must give to the minister a much greater and more avowed influence: it was believed that he now received from many quarters stronger and more explicit assurances of confidence and support. He was remarkable for that resolution, which is a qualification so necessary to success. His having undertaken the support of Government at the time he did, shewed that he knew enough of the nature of party to despise the clamours of it if he did not deserve them; and his parliamentary character left no room to suspect he would give any cause of just reproach: many therefore were inclined to adhere to a minister of whose constancy they were assured, in whose principles and measures they could safely confide, and who held out a plan of constitutional policy as the only bond of that union which he wished to form.

This writer next observes, that the haughty terms demanded for the re-admission of Mr. P. and his friends into the ministry, united the sober serious part of the nation with the present minister; and (continues he) it was the sentiment of almost all the kingdom which a noble duke expressed, when he said, He



wished to guard the crown though but in the office of a petty constable, rather than see it exposed to so insolent an attack.' The indecencies, falsties, and abuse, published by the North Briton, strengthened the hands of government with all moderate men; and their treaty of August that year, in which they courted the earl of B. heightened the odium of the public against them, as it shewed either that they knew themselves the falsehood of the abuse which they had encouraged; or that they would not hesitate to unite themselves to the object of it, if he would open for them the door to power.'

Mr. Grenville adopted a system, according to this author, that went upon principles directly contrary to those which had guided the discarded faction, who had always ruled by making their sovereigns believe, that one half of the nation were the enemies of the present establishment, and that the other, which they themselves headed, were its only support. To this exclusion of above one half of the kingdom from public posts, they added the affectation of being, by their experience and abilities, the only adepts in the art of government. Mr. Grenville's plan threw down those partition-walls, and opened a door for admitting, without distinction of party, every honest subject to the service of his sovereign. He did more, he seized the only tenable posts of opposing patriots, those of publick virtue and œconomy. The first, by introducing into the nation a plan of English policy; and the latter, by putting an end to a devouring war, and the most expensive measures Great Britain had ever been engaged in. Our author then shews how very ill qualified Mr. P. was in his own person and disposition to be the head of a party. He likewise examines all the other sorts of the opposition, and demonstrates upon what wretched principles its heads had acted while in power, and to what pitiful shifts they were reduced, and of what contradictory ingredients they were composed.

The writer proceeds to take a survey of the points upon which the opposers tried their forces; those of privilege, the cyder tax, general warrants, the government-regulations, and taxes of the colonies. The following thoughts upon the first of those points are equally just, uncommon, and indeed new to the public.

The first ground of debate which the opposition took, was in support of the opinion given in the court of Common Pleas, that Mr. Wilkes was entitled to privilege for his seditious libel.

In this they were unfortunate. It was not necessary to trace privilege up to its source, to prove the falsehood of this doctrine; that such a number of men should have exemption in criminal cases, must, in itself, be a greater evil than any it could prevent; and must be a grievance more heavy in proportion as the

state was more free. For if freedom be the power of doing every thing which the law does not forbid, a privilege against the restraint of law inflicts a badge of slavery and all its consequences upon all those to whom it is not extended, and destroys at once our so much boasted constitution. These consequences were so sensibly felt, that the party were soon forced to relinquish all hopes of making this a popular cause; and to trust to that favour within the House, which is generally given to those who pretend to defend its privileges.

Our readers can scarcely be supposed ignorant of the subsequent events that attended the expulsion and exile of Mr. Wilkes; but this author has set aside the opinion of lord Coke on the point of privilege, so far as it favoured Mr. Wilkes, and likewise of lord chief justice Holt; the first, because it was grounded on a case that Coke had never read, and proved to be nothing to the purpose; and the second, because the opinion is spurious, and falsely fathered upon Holt. He then considers the tax upon cyder, which he places in a very fair light, and fully vindicates the ministry's proceedings on that head. General warrants afterwards fall under his consideration; and the inconsistencies of the opposition on this head are fully exposed.

‘Every body (says he) has seen those (the general warrants) of Mr. Pitt. In them, not only the names of the persons to be apprehended are omitted, but they do not even specify the crime, the cause of apprehension. This omission, as having been, and capable of being abused to the most arbitrary purposes, had been declared by the petition of rights to be contrary to law. The nation therefore would have seconded the heaviest censure which could have been imposed upon those, who, while they covered their opposition to government, by pretences to zeal for the liberties of the people, had shewn themselves thus capable of using their own power in a manner directly contrary to the most sacred and acknowledged claims of their freedom.’

The system of foreign policy falls next under this writer's pen. ‘Much, indeed (says he) has been said by the late secretary upon the expedience of foreign alliances, and the forming a balance of power, and much reproach thrown on those whom he accuses of neglecting this great object; but if we examine his conduct, we shall find this one of those specious declarations, which, however easily they flow from his warm imagination, are totally unsupported by fact. It would be going too far out of the way to enter into the particulars, but whoever will view the state of our alliances at the time he left the seals, and after he had exhausted our treasury to purchase them, will see that France, Spain, and Vienna, were in actual hostilities;

Holland,



Holland, soothed and irritated by turns, was held but by a thread; that our friendship with Denmark has since that time been improved; that we paid 670,000 l. to Prussia for the assistance of some 4000 dragoons during part of one campaign; and that we had actually no one ally in Europe but count de Lippe; for I do not call Hesse, whose towns we garrisoned, whose army we paid, even whose damages we reimburse, by the name of an ally; and he will be inclined to approve the more wise and frugal conduct of the present government, which seem to think that no friendships can be bought which are contrary to the interests, and that few need be bought which are consistent with the interests of the parties who form them. These too are the sentiments of Montesquieu!

He then proceeds to consider the case of our colonies and the taxes to which they have been subjected, a subject, which we have already considered (see p. 225.) and the reader will here find additional arguments in defence of the administration's conduct. The last head of his argumentation turns upon our domestic administration, which is here treated with great candour and accuracy; and his reasoning on that head, we think, is unanswerable. The first step (says he) which Mr. Grenville took on this subject, was to recal that German commissariate, which had been opened to receive all the demands which those who had said they had lost, or who thought they had not gained enough in the service of the allies, were ready to make. He instituted a commission of only three gentlemen to descend into the detail of those demands, and by their means at the end of the last session the sums stood thus:

The whole which they had examined was said to

be

Of this they had allowed

They postponed, till further proofs could

be brought

1,354,000

103,000

263,000

366,000

988,000

And by this means, near another million sterling was already saved to the public.

Mr. Grenville was by his enemies accused of having been profuse in pensions; and (continues this author) those writers of the party, who are paid by dinners and promises for filling the public papers with abusive falsehoods, had, from time to time, assured us, that the earl of — and a certain right honourable gentleman, and lady — &c. &c. &c. had received pensions of 2, 3, and 4000 l. a year.

The minister would not suffer the public ear to be so grossly

abused;

abused; he declared therefore in the most public manner, that from the time he had been entrusted with the care of the revenue, only two pensions had been granted; one springing from the compassion of his royal master, and confirmed by the feelings of every humane mind, to the afflicted family of lady M—h; the other bestowed on an old and esteemed servant of the state, and one who had served with great ability and honour for a great number of years, in one of the most active and confidential departments of government.

The subsequent part of this pamphlet is severe upon a late secretary; and tends to establish a point by which we are fully convinced, that the present administration is by no means so unpopular in the nation as its enemies have represented it to be. In fact (concludes this author) such a system as that which is now pursued, must be approved where-ever it is known; it must secure esteem and bestow reputation. The little arts of calumny and faction have tried to defame and to oppose, but in vain; those who submit to practise them, see their numbers daily diminish, recur by turns to party-clamour, and low intrigue, with equal disappointment; and behold with all the pangs of envy and of disappointed ambition, what every honest man must see with pleasure, the encreasing reputation of those whose administration is directed by maxims of strict frugality and public justice, of English policy and of constitutional principles.

*X. A full and free Enquiry into the Merits of the Peace; with some Strictures on the Spirit of Party. 8vo. Pr. 2 s. Payne.*

**T**HIS pamphlet, which appears to be of no vulgar composition, unites in one point of light all the arguments which are dispersed in the several political publications which we have reviewed. It is written professedly on the side of administration, and in a manner that does honour to the temper, candour, and capacity of the author.

He begins by describing the delusive state of Great Britain at the glorious close of the late war, when she was becoming every day more weak, more indigent and distressed, and advancing every moment farther and farther within the ruthless gripe of undertakers, contractors, and alley-jobbers. The writer's reasoning on this subject cannot be too much attended to, because the circumstances the nation was then in, are decisive of the question as to the necessity of making the peace. He observes, that before the peace was made, there had been great differences between Mr. P. and other servants of the king. He then proceeds upon



upon the principles of equity and the laws of peace and war, to try the merits of the definitive treaty. He states very fairly the disputes between France and England concerning the limits of Nova Scotia; he represents France as having been in the wrong, but thinks that upon the above mentioned principles, Great Britain could not fairly have demanded any other satisfaction from her, that what she obtained by the peace. He appeals to the late administration, and indeed to all England, whether the protection of our North-American colonies was not the popular demand of all ranks and degrees of men before and during the late war; and he describes the vast acquisitions and security which both they and the mother-country have acquired by the peace.

That our readers may form an idea of this writer's impartiality, we shall in his own words give them his state of the objections to the peace.

The distracted and ruined condition of France, beaten out of the East and almost intirely out of the West-Indies, without a fleet, without a treasury, a bankrupt people, and a government without credit; all this taken along with the prosperous and triumphant condition of Great Britain, and the important acquisitions she had made from the year 1761 that the negotiation was broke off by Mr. P. to the year 1762 that the conferences were renewed by Lord B. gave a fair and advantageous opportunity, on the recommencement of these conferences, for weakening and humbling France as a maritime power, and for raising and aggrandising the importance of Great Britain in this respect, so as to render the former incapable hereafter to hurt, and the latter for the future perfectly secure. That the enormous debt of the nation necessarily incurred by the war, and solely occasioned by the bad faith and rapacious spirit of France, called aloud for indemnification and reimbursement. That both the one and the other of these were to have been obtained by excluding intirely the French from the fish trade of Newfoundland and the gulph of St. Laurence, and by at least keeping possession of the rich and precious island of Guadaloupe in the West-Indies, and both the settlements of Goree and Senegal on the coast of Africa. These would have been to us an immediate source of riches and strength, by giving the most extensive scope to trade, augmenting our shipping, and establishing an inexhaustible nursery of seamen, the only true and solid strength of the nation. The interest of North America itself required this, as Guadaloupe would have been a great and additional market for their lumber and provisions; and the prosperity and advantages thereby mutually arising to both, would in the result have highly advanced the interest and prosperity of Britain. That it would have been infinitely more eligible,

gible, rather than have failed in this point, to have admitted the French again into a part of their former possessions in North America, and given them the barren soil of Canada to work upon: for the advantages arising there, are at a very remote period, not to say very uncertain; but those proceeding from the possession of the sugar islands are immediate and of the most substantial kind, and what the debt of the nation stands in the most immediate and real need of. But in place of all this, to reinstate the French in the fishery, the African and sugar trade; is to restore to them all the certain sources of that naval power by which they have been already so very formidable, and will again be enabled very soon to give scope to their insatiable ambition by a renewal of the war. When added to all this it is taken into view, that they are restored intirely to all their former trade in the East Indies; that the interest of our heroic and magnanimous ally, the king of Prussia, was deserted from the beginning to the end of the treaty; and that out of all our important conquests in the West-Indies, only the worst of the neutral islands with the insignificant islands of the Grenades and Grenadines were shared out to us, whilst St. Lucia and its excellent port were given up to the French: we may venture to conclude, notwithstanding all the additional conquests we made in the interval of the discussions of peace, that the definitive treaty, with all those advantages said to be on its side, has concluded a much worse peace than what Mr. P. planned, even when he was as to Germany under many and great difficulties, and as to the West-Indies unprovided with the conquests of Martinico and the Havanna; and that upon the whole, the peace is inadequate to our conquests, dishonourable, disadvantageous, and insecure.

We are of opinion that those objections are more fairly and candidly stated than they are satisfactorily answered. The author thinks, that to have excluded the French from the Newfoundland fish-trade; and to have retained possession of Guadaloup, Senegal, and Goree, would have been passing the line of justice and moderation, and have manifested a spirit of wild barbarous ambition. This opinion, considering the provocations of Great Britain from the power of France, is perhaps controvertible; and, our author will not, amongst the professed politicians of the present age, find many admirers, we had almost said readers, of the moral and religious motives of pacification which he has introduced.—He next reverses the scene, and puts us in the situation of France and Spain at the time of the peace, when they had it in their power to have conquered Portugal, and when they might have been masters of Hesse and Hanover as well as Minorca. He disfigures our sentiments, and shows what our rea-  
soning



soning would have been in so unfortunate a situation; and how the public of Great Britain would have relished a peace concluded by her government, upon the same humiliating terms as France yielded to in the late peace. He is of opinion, that if we had insisted upon the above-mentioned terms, France would have buried herself in her own ruins, rather than have accepted them. He is strong on this head; and very properly observes, that when Lewis the XIVth came to that resolution, previous to the treaty of Utrecht, if more shameful terms had been demanded of him, France was in a much worse condition than she was, with regard to the real strength and spirit of that nation at the conclusion of the late treaty. He then considers the consequences in point of interest that must have attended Great Britain insisting upon demands that France would not grant. Our national debt must have been encreased eight or ten millions annually. Our manufacturers and agriculture were suffering for want of hands, and our army and navy were deficient in half their complement of men. He paints the consequences of all those disadvantages; and shews that the continuance of the war must have required at least 10 or 15,000 men to be raised in Great Britain besides the usual complement.

Our sensible author reminds us of the favourable interposition of providence (or as some affect to call it fortune) in many of the chief operations of the late war; the insatiation of the French in not taking advantage of the storm, that, in 1757, dispersed our fleet, and drove it from Louisbourg; the panic that seized them when we landed on that island, under the most dreadful and discouraging circumstances; Wolfe's fortunate ascent to the plains of Abraham at Quebec; the critical capitulation of Guadaloupe; our successes at Belleisle; the unaccountable conduct and cowardice of the French, which gave us possession of Martinico; with many other incidents. He also considers the growing spirit of discontent and division among ourselves, and how it might have operated to our destruction had the war continued, and the danger of a general confederacy against us, which our author is of opinion would have covered the seas with a fleet equal to our own. In this we must be of a different opinion from this writer; nor did we ever, before he told it as a fact, conceive that Venice could of herself have furnished twenty line of battle ships of eighty guns each.

He then examines the value of Guadaloupe, compared with the immense expence and danger that must have attended the continuance of the war; and shews, that the returning Canada to the French must have afforded more colourable reasons for opposition than any that are now urged. He shews the immense riches and the great advantages arising to Great Britain by their acquisition of Canada, its vast value above  
Guada-

Guadaloupe, and the little probability that there is of the French rivalling us in the Newfoundland fish-trade.

I beg leave then most humbly to conclude upon this head, that it was not the interest of Great Britain to continue the war: that as we could not exclude the French from the fish-trade, and keep possession of Guadaloupe, Senegal and Goree, without continuing the war; it was directly and immediately the advantage and interest of Great Britain to conclude peace upon the honourable, advantageous and enlarged terms the enemy agreed to: and that to have exchanged Canada, or any part of the enemy's former dominion in North America, for Guadaloupe; would have been most essentially hurtful and injurious to the nation, in its dearest and greatest interest.

Our author investigates the merits of the two negotiations, carried on in the respective years of 1761 and 1762. This is a subject which the public has been long in possession of, from authenticated papers, and has been so often discussed in the course of our own publications, that we can add nothing to his arguments, which fully vindicate the propriety and advantages of the late peace, and shew it to have been the best that we possibly could have obtained. The author, through the whole of his arguments, shews great knowledge of his subject. — He proceeds to consider the state and disposition of the nation and parliament after the establishment of the peace, and the high approbation it met with from the legislature. He chastizes the authors of the public clamour against lord B. and the government, on account of bribery and corruption. Had that been the case, he thinks that whatever idea we might have of the *corrupted*, the *corrupters* merited our highest praise. He says, it is ridiculous to imagine, that a parliament (he must mean the majority) can be bribed. He might receive an answer to this argument by perusing the writings and pamphlets published against Sir Robert Walpole. He is much more defensible in the particular examination he has made of the charges brought against the present ministry, which he shews to be trifling, ridiculous, or false. He enters into a severe scrutiny of the writings and conduct of Mr. Wilkes, and shews the wicked tendency of every thing that leads to weaken or abolish the union of Scotland and England; and mentions the commendable partiality exercised by Mr. Pitt in favour of Scotchmen, who were the most obnoxious to a whig administration. He dates the era of the present administration from May 1762, when the duke of N. resigned; justifies the conduct of lord B. and very plainly proves, that the Highlanders, who had been formerly in the rebellion of 1745, had been introduced into our army during the administration of the duke



duke of N. and Mr. P. He concludes with some general observations on the demands made upon the crown in the famous conference of August 1763, but preserves the highest respect for Mr. P.

If dispassionate enquiry and representation are the signs of a good cause, and an accurate stating of facts the proof of an able head, we must be of opinion, that both the subject and the writing of this pamphlet deserves from the public the greatest degree of attention.

## FOREIGN ARTICLE.

XI. *Le Siège de Calais, Tragédie, dédié au Roi, Par M. De Belloy, Représentée pour la première fois, par les Comédiens François ordinaires du Roi, le 13 Février. A Paris, 8vo. 2s. Nourse and Vaillant.*

**H**AD this play appeared merely as a dramatic performance, its plot and characters might have passed unnoticed among the other numerous monuments of French vanity; but when it is mentioned as meriting the patronage of that government, on account of the justice that the author does to the English nation; when it is mentioned as a reconciling piece, and, as such, liberally rewarded by Royalty itself; when the author plumes himself, as he does in his preface, on the favours showered down upon him by the French king and people, we are to estimate from that, the comparative ideas which the present French court and nation form between their own virtue and valour, and that of the English. The story on which the play is founded is antient, but the application of it is confessedly modern; nor can we think that a true Englishman can look upon it in any other light than as a wilful misrepresentation of history, that the author may give his countrymen at once the highest contempt and detestation of the English, and impress them with the strongest veneration for the virtue and courage of their own ancestors.

We are perhaps not to blame a Frenchman for a conduct like this, at the close of a war which overwhelmed their country with loss, shame, and confusion; but to pretend that the author does the smallest justice to the English king and nation, and that he does not degrade them, even to infamy, is offering an insult to the understanding of the public. The author, M. de Belloy, observes, in his Preface, that strangers enquire, how it is possible that a people, who for above a century have excelled all others in the dramatic art, never should have dipt into its own history for theatrical subjects.—While (continues he) most of the English tragedies are taken from the history of

of England. The glory of England's having produced a Shakespear and an Otway, renders M. de Belloy's vaunt of France's superiority in the dramatic art ridiculous as well as false; and we know no poet of great note, excepting Shakespear, who founded his plays on the English history. But how very different are the writings of that sun of genius, from those of M. de Belloy! Though we could mention fifty speeches in Shakespear's historical plays, each of them of more value than all that the French theatre ever produced, yet he never deviates from history. His kings, his heroes, his men, his women; their actions, their virtues, and their vices, are the same as they come from Hollinshed, Grafton, Hall, and other ancient writers. If any of his scenes are embellished with fiction, it is such as he has either borrowed from history, or such as can have no manner of effect in prejudice to the French nation.

How much is M. de Belloy's conduct the reverse of this! His play opens with two capital misrepresentations, to prepossess the readers and spectators against English valour.

Two of his patriots, Eustache de Saint-Pierre, and Ambletuse, are left to command in Calais, in the absence of the count de Vienne, its governor, who is supposed to be gone to assist in raising the siege, and is attended by the son of Eustache, a brave young man. While they are every hour expecting the event, Saint-Pierre bewails the revolt of Godfrey d'Harcourt (who in fact is the hero of the piece) from his natural sovereign, the French king; and, to prepossess his readers, he tells them, that the conquest of France by the English was owing to this Frenchman.

*'La France doit sa perte aux talens d'un Français.'*

*'France to a Frenchman's courage owes her ruin.'*

That a Norman of the name of Harcourt was in Edward's army is true, and that he served under the prince of Wales; but we know of nothing that distinguished him from the other officers who attended that great conqueror, he being but just mentioned in the list of commanders before the battle. At the battle of Cressy he is afterwards said to have been seized with remorse of conscience for fighting against his country; but Mr. Barnes, in his Life of Edward III. very justly observes (p. 361.) that he afterwards not only lived in good correspondence with that king, but actually lost his life in his service.

The next expedient our author makes use of for depreciating the valour of the English is, that they brought a huge train of brass cannon to the field, and that the French were even ignorant of the use of gunpowder. Says Saint-Pierre,

• Eh!



\* Eh! que peut désormais tout l'effort d'un grand cœur  
Contre les noirs Volcans d'un airain destructeur,  
Qui semble renfermer le dépôt du tonnerre;  
Et dont le seul Anglais effraye encor la terre.

*Against those brazen Vulcans of the field,  
That hold the stores of thunder, which the English  
Alone command, and therewith shake the world,  
All valour must be vain.*

Thus, according to our poet, the English had the same advantage over the French, that the Spaniards had over the Americans. Now the truth is, that it does not appear from any ancient writer (for Mezeray is but a modern one) that Edward fired a single cannon in this siege; and it can be proved from undoubted records, that when great guns came into use, the French were more early acquainted with them than the English. We are somewhat at a loss to know what the poet means when he calls artillery

\* Monument infernal d'un siècle d'ignorance,  
Où l'art de se détruire est la seule science.

*Hellish invention of a barbarous age,  
Stranger to all the arts, but those of murder.*

While this conversation is passing between the two French patriots, they are apalled, by a sudden silence from without the walls; from which they conclude that their king and his army had been repulsed in their attempts to relieve the city. While Ambleruse goes out to know the truth, Alienor, the daughter of Vienne, (who is supposed to have been contracted to Godfrey d'Harcourt, when the unworthy treatment he met with at court made him throw himself into the arms of the English) enters in tears, and confirms his suspicions of the French having been defeated by those villainous instruments of war. The loyal Harcourt, Godfrey's brother, is killed, the king is wounded, and her father a prisoner.

\* Nos braves (says she) chevaliers, & mon père à leur tête,  
De cent globes de fer ont bravé la tempête.

*My father led our Frenchmen on, and stood*

*The iron entrails of an hundred cannon.*

No wonder then the French did not succeed, and that they were completely vanquished. Sainte-Pierre then learns that his son had behaved very bravely; and it gives him great pleasure when he hears that he was wounded and carried off by his soldiers.

‘ Il respire ! & son sang a coulé pour la France !  
 Double faveur des cieux qui se répand sur moi !  
 J’ai donc un fils encore à donner à mon roi !’

*He lives ! and he has shed his blood for France !  
 Thanks, gracious heav’n, for this thy double favour !  
 That I have yet a son to give my king !*

Alienor, who, according to the poet, is the only fiditious character in the play, shews a becoming concern for her father, whom she is afraid that Edward, who pretends to be lawful king of France, may put to death as a rebel ; but she is comforted by the hopes which Saint-Pierre has in the virtues of Godfrey d’Harcourt, who is Edward’s favourite and general, and is here remembered by Alienor with a mixture of indignation and concern. In the fifth scene, young Saint-Pierre, who is here called Aurele, having rallied his men, and repulsed the English general Mauni, throws himself into the town, and appears upon the stage. He gives an affecting account of the loyal Harcourt’s death ; and that he himself had been wounded by Godfrey, who saw his brother in the agonies of death.

In the sixth scene, Saint-Pierre, who by the bye is the mayor of Calais, makes a long harangue to his fellow-citizens, in the old strain of French valour, and English unmerited good fortune. He shews them their own miserable situation, but exhorts them to perseverance and loyalty. Speaking of his own king, he says,

‘ Nous mourrons pour le roi, pour qui nous vivions tous.’  
*We live for him, and for him let us die.*

He is seconded by Alienor, who advises them to make a funeral pile of their city, and throw themselves into it, promising to shew them the example, rather than stand the consequence of a storm. Aurele praises her resolution ; but is checked by the thoughts of his aged father’s death. Saint-Pierre stops him as he is going out to put the fatal advice into execution. He then proposes that Ambletuse should go to the English camp, and offer to surrender Calais and all its riches to Edward, provided the inhabitants are suffered to repair to their king.

The second act opens with a soliloquy of Godfrey d’Harcourt, who appears to be haunted by the remembrance of his brother’s death, the remorse of his own conscience, and his love for Alienor ; all which concur in driving him to Calais ; where he sends an English officer to Alienor. She believes Harcourt to be an English Lord, sent by Edward to make some proposals concerning her father. Harcourt then discovers, and throws him-  
 self



self at her feet, stands the tempest of her indignation, and tells her that Edward respects her father. Overjoyed at this news, she is about to retire; and Harcourt practises the stale trick of laying his hand upon his sword, and threatening to run himself through the body if she does not hear him: an animated and indeed interesting conversation follows. Harcourt promises by his future conduct to make amends for his apostacy; and she consents to pardon him if he makes good his promise. In the next scene, lord Mauni, Saint-Pierre, and the other Calisians, appear upon the stage. He treats them as rebels; but tells them, Edward rejects every other condition of surrender but that of putting into his hands six citizens, who are to be put to death by the executioner. Austele takes fire at this proposal, and resumes Alienor's scheme of the funeral pile, to which the Calisians seem to agree, when they are stopt by Harcourt, who promises either to mollify Edward, or to mingle his blood with that of the unhappy victims.

Upon the departure of Harcourt, Mauni acquaints the Calisians with Edward's inflexibility, and gives the following reason for it:

*' Il croit qu'en ce moment la rigueur tyrannique*

*Est une loi d'état, un devoir politique;*

*Et je crains que d'Harcourt l'impétueux courroux,*

*En voulant vous sauver, ne le perde avec vous.'*

*The time he thinks demands a tyrant's sway;*

*True policy—the laws of state, require it;*

*And much I fear, from Harcourt's hasty spirit,*

*That, pleading for you, he may share your fate.*

The Calisians, by Ambletuse and Alienor's advice, are again running into desperate measures, when Saint-Pierre offers himself for the first victim; his son claims the honour of being the second; Ambletuse succeeds, and the number is soon complete. They deliver up their swords to Mauni, who sheds tears at so affecting a scene; and informs Alienor, that Edward expects to see her, and that possibly she may prevail with him to spare the prisoners. Upon this, Alienor, turning to Saint-Pierre, says,

*' Que veut-il de moi ?*

*Magnanime héros, je te donne ma foi*

*De ne point consentir à racheter ta vie,*

*Que par des actions que ta grande âme envie.*

SAINT PIERRE.

*Ah ! voilà la vertu qui sied à votre cœur :*

*Bravez plus que la mort, en bravant le malheur.'*

## ALIENOR.

*What can his meaning be?— O gen'rous hero!*

*Never shall Alienor thy safety purchase,*

*But by some glorious act, thy self must envy.*

SAINT-PIERRE.

*There spoke the virtuous heart—To face misfortune*

*Is more than facing death.*

[To be concluded in our next.]

## MONTHLY CATALOGUE.

12. *Thoughts on a Question of Importance proposed to the Public, Whether it is probable that the Immense Extent of Territory acquired by this Nation at the late Peace, will operate towards the Prosperity, or the Ruin of the Island of Great Britain.* 8vo. Pr. 1s. Dixwell.

WE can almost pronounce this writer, by his taking a walk through the streets of London, and quoting *Baron Montesquieu*, to be a *Scotchman*.—Hail! thou worthy acquisition to that disinterestedness and public spirit which every hackney political writer for a century and a half past, from *Martin Marprelate* down to the *North-Briton*, has claimed as his characteristic, and the sole motive of his publications! Hail! labours that “have been generated (to use the words of our author in his Preface) by reading and reflexion on the history of other nations.” But to be serious; notwithstanding the awkward pertness of this writer, and his miserable deficiency in that kind of knowledge requisite for the subject he undertakes, his question deserves consideration.

The sum of his thoughts are, That the late general peace may prove detrimental, nay, ruinous to this nation. He supports his opinion in the manner that may be expected from a man who reads *baron Montesquieu*, and ruminates on the antient histories he had been taught at school, without considering, that however fashionable it is now to quote that Frenchman, his ideas of the English constitution and interests are very fallible; and that neither *Livy* nor *Tacitus*, *Cicero* nor *Cæsar*, ever formed the least notion of a mercantile sovereign state.

A little attention to, or acquaintance with, the history of the late general peace and the last war, would have been of more service to him than all his classical knowledge or French read-



ing; and while he was *taking a walk through the streets of London*, their opulence and splendor ought to have instructed him, that our colonies, so far from being the ruin, are the strength and support of their mother country. The immense territory acquired by the late peace was connected with other causes than the rage for extending dominion; for it was in a manner forced upon Great Britain. Whatever speculative notions this author may entertain, it was her duty and capital interest to vindicate the rights and possessions of her American colonists; and it was evident, from the very principles on which the war was founded and conducted, that this could not be done, while a restless, ambitious, enterprizing people, in the neighbourhood, had it in their power every hour to attack, alarm, rob, and murder them.

Our author is afraid of the depopulation of this country, from the population of our American colonies. Many grave, wise, and pious patriots, entertained the same fear above a hundred and fifty years ago, and with much better reason; but every day's experience proves it to be groundless; for our colonies have amply replaced all the hands they borrowed from their mother country. There is no danger of depopulation to a country the enjoyment of which is the great object that is to answer the ultimate ambition and wishes of its most wealthy colonists. But our author, on so important and trite a subject, ought to have known, that at least one third of our North American colonies have not been peopled from Great-Britain. We are, however, so far of this writer's opinion, that we with some method could be found for peopling our acquisitions with good subjects who are not natives of the mother country. That such a scheme is practicable experience convinces us. We cannot agree with him as to the great numbers of manufacturers who have gone over from England to America; and he himself furnishes us with a very good argument why we should not; because he takes his information from common news-papers, and hackney politicians.

He proceeds to examine our exclusive right to trade with our colonies, which he thinks may be pernicious to the mother country. This is an argument which strikes at the general principles of all colonization. Though the bounds of our undertaking did not debar us from entering into it, yet we should avoid it, because the writer has said nothing new upon the subject, and his arguments are weaker than those that have appeared in former publications of the same kind. But, notwithstanding what we have said on this head, we are most zealously of opinion, that the British government, while they are consulting the welfare of our colonies, ought to con-

sult likewise the means of keeping them in a dutiful dependence on their mother country. This great and salutary end, however, never can be answered by such publications as that before us.

13. *A North-Briton Extraordinary. Which was printed but never published. Pr. 6d. Moran.*

We have strong reasons for believing Mr. Wilkes to have been the real author of this paper. He begins in the following manner. 'Whatever difference we may find in other respects between the present and late minister, in the exertion of a determined and inflexible resolution, they certainly bear a near resemblance to each other. One distinction, indeed, ought to be made even here, that Mr. Pitt's resolution arose from conscious virtue, and the Earl of \*\*\*'s from conscious power; but to the credit of the latter we must observe, that he has shown as inflexible a spirit in supporting every measure which was wrong, as the former could possibly maintain in promoting what was right. Regardless of all petty and private considerations, blessed with the most excellent qualities of head and heart, and sincerely attached to the interests of his country, Mr. Pitt proceeded with that well-grounded confidence, to which he was entitled by those qualifications, and in which he was justified by the most extraordinary success. Without any real regard to this country, wholly engrossed by private views, the qualities of his head as yet doubtful, and those of his heart too plain, the Earl of \*\*\* hath, through his administration, behaved with that insolence, which in narrow minds is always the consequence of power.'—Surely political, of all knowledge, is the most fallible: who could have thought that this monster of a statesman, in a few months after this paper was written, was to be applied to and courted as the right hand, the guardian, and the pole-star of this angel of a minister! Who could have imagined that ever the *guide* of all *guides* would have submitted himself to have been *guided* by such a weak, wicked man, though he has not been known, ever since he abdicated his power, to have entered into any one measure that could make the smallest atonement for his past misconduct!

Proceed we to the principal purpose of this publication, which now first appears abroad, and which is no other than a vindication of Mr. Rous, the East-India director, with regard to the share he took in settling articles of the late peace relating to the East-India company. As the subject is now unreasonable, and as the dispute ought to be confined solely to the company, we can only say, that it seems intended to

load



load the late lord Egremont with the blame of what was *likely* to have been done amiss; and as the matter has been often discussed in public, we shall here take our leave of it.

14. *Considerations on Taxes, as they are supposed to affect the Price of Labour in our Manufacturies: also some Reflections on the general Behaviour and Disposition of the Manufacturing Populace of this Kingdom; shewing, by Arguments drawn from Experience, that nothing but Necessity will enforce Labour; and that no State ever did, or ever can, make any considerable Figure in Trade, where the Necessaries of Life are at a low Price.* 8vo. Pr. 1s. 6d. Johnson.

This author is of opinion that 'our taxes, and particularly those on the necessaries of life, have not hitherto, *so raised the price of labour in our manufactures, as to injure our foreign trade.*' He grounds his opinion upon facts and experience, in opposition to theories, which arise from *deceitful appearances, fallacious reasonings, and common prejudices.* It must be acknowledged that his opinion at first seems to be not a little paradoxical; for he thinks that 'taxes on the necessaries of life tend to enforce general industry, to restrain idleness and debauchery, to improve our manufactures, and to make labour cheap a *variety of ways.*' He tells us that the Dutch are three times more taxed than we are; and though their power, as a state, is upon the decline, yet their commerce is flourishing, and their individuals very rich.

This sensible author combats the common opinion 'That the necessaries which the manufacturing poor consume, being rendered dear by taxes, must inevitably oblige them to raise the price of their labour; which will, of course, enhance the price of our manufactures, and injure our foreign trade. I wonder not that this opinion should prevail, as every one clearly sees, that if a populace can live cheap, they can afford to labour cheap; from whence it is immediately concluded that they will do so.'

'But those who have closely attended to the disposition and conduct of a manufacturing populace, have always found, that labouring *less*, and not *cheaper*, has been the consequence of a low price of provisions; and that when provisions are dear, from whatever cause, labour is always plenty, always well performed, and, of course, is always cheap. This is a paradox which nothing but experience could teach us to explain. In order to do this, let us observe, first, That mankind in general are naturally inclined to ease and indolence, and that nothing but absolute necessity will enforce labour and industry. Se-

condly, That the poor, in general, work only for the bare necessities of life, and for the means of a low debauch, which when obtained they cease to labour, till roused again by necessity. Thirdly, That it is best for themselves, as well as for society, that the poor should be constantly employed.

He then recommends matrimony, as being of infinite advantage to a trading state; but his great argument for taxing the necessities of life arises from the habitual indolence of the English common people, who will not work half the week if they can possibly subsist without it. He thinks that the great clamour about the high price of wheat, and other provisions, is ill founded. 'The average price of wheat, says he, for twenty years past, is not above half what it was for twenty years together an hundred and twenty years ago.' And he affirms that provisions are certainly at this time cheaper in this kingdom than in any other country in Europe. We are of opinion that the facts he has brought to support this are true, and that the principle is therefore irrefragable. The publication is the more useful on account of the public discontents that are so artfully propagated on its subject.

15. *Considerations relative to a Bill under the Consideration of a Committee of the House of Commons, for taking off the Duty on all raw Silk of every Denomination, that shall be imported into Great-Britain. Humbly offered to the Right Honourable Charles Townshend. 8vo. Pr. 6d. Wilkie.*

This affair is of great importance: we are cautious in passing our judgment upon commercial affairs; but we think that this pamphlet deserves attention; that its author is master of his subject, and writes with precision, temper, and discernment.

16. *An Essay on the Duty and Qualifications of a Sea-Officer. Written originally for the Use of two young Officers. 8vo. 2s. Johnston.*

It has been often observed, that a *by-stander* sees more of the game than a player. The author of this excellent pamphlet does not himself seem to have been, properly speaking, a sea officer; but he certainly has had great experience in, and opportunities of knowing, the service. It is amazing, when we consider the interesting concern that this country ought to have in her marine department, that this is the first performance which has been composed for the use of sea-officers, for instructing them in the prudential, the liberal, the moral, and the religious part



part of their business; and, indeed, in every thing but what regards its mechanical and scientific parts.

This author's instructions to his two young officers, are drawn up in a perspicuous, plain, but elegant manner. They appear to be the fruits of long experience, and the result of profound attention to his subject, and they are occasionally strengthened by observations and characters that throw great lights upon the naval history of England. After laying before his two young officers the importance and general duties of their profession, and telling them that many endowments must be added to that necessary one of being a practical seaman, he proceeds to particulars; but we must give the whole of the pamphlet, the profits of which are dedicated to two public charities, if we should transcribe every excellent or useful advice, that is here laid down. Upon the whole, we most sincerely think that this performance deserves public encouragement; and that a better service could not be done to the nation, than for our admiralty to order that every officer, together with his instructions and lists, should be accommodated with one of those Essays, printed in a convenient size.

17. *Poems by Charles Churchill. Vol. II. 4to. Pr. 10s. 6d.*  
Flexney.

This volume contains Mr. Churchill's Conference, Author, Duellist, the three books of Gotham, his Candidate, Farewell, Times, Independence, and a poem called the Journey, which seems to be unfinished, and is the only piece in the volume that we have not already reviewed.

The author sets out with the advice his friends give him, not to run out his stock of genius by his repeated rapid publications, and then proceeds as follows:

\* Recover'd from the vanity of youth,  
I feel, alas! this melancholy truth,  
Thanks to each cordial, each advising friend,  
And am, if not too late, resolv'd to mend,  
Resolv'd to give some respite to my pen,  
Apply myself once more to books and men,  
View what is present, what is past review,  
And my old stock exhausted lay in new.  
For twice six moons (let winds, turn'd porters, bear  
This oath to heav'n) for twice six moons I swear,  
No Muse shall tempt me with her siren lay;  
Nor draw me from Improvement's thorny way.  
Verse I abjure, nor will forgive that friend,  
Who in my hearing shall a rhyme commend.

' It cannot be—Whether I will, or no,  
 Such as they are, my thoughts in measure flow.  
 Convinc'd, determin'd, I in prose begin,  
 But ere I write one sentence, verse creeps in,  
 And taints me thro' and thro': by this good light  
 In verse I talk by day, I dream by night;  
 If now and then I curse, my curses chime,  
 Nor can I pray, unless I pray in rime.  
 E'en now I err, in spite of common sense,  
 And my confession doubles my offence.'

Though we are unwilling to take that liberty now with Mr. Churchill's works which we did in his life-time, or to continue those animadversions which he felt so sensibly, yet we can see nothing original in this quotation.

*Quicquid conabar dicere versus erat.*

OVID.

I lisp'd in numbers, for the numbers came. POPE.

are the texts of our bard's poetical sermon. He then resigns himself to his propensity for rhyme; but, as if recovering himself, he proceeds thus:

' Far from me now be ev'ry tuneful Maid,  
 I neither ask, nor can receive their aid.  
 Pegasus turn'd into a common hack,  
 Alone I jog, and keep the beaten track,  
 Nor would I have the sisters of the hill  
 Behold their bard in such a dishabille.  
 Absent, but only absent for a time,  
 Let them caress some dearer son of rime,  
 Let them, as far as decency permits,  
 Without suspicion, play the fool with wits,  
 'Gainst fools be guarded; 'tis a certain rule,  
 Wits are safe things, there's danger in a fool.

' Let them, tho' modest, Gray more modest woo,  
 Let them with Mason bleat, and bray, and coo:  
 Let them with Franklin, proud of some small Greek,  
 Make Sophocles, disguis'd, in English speak;  
 Let them with Glover o'er Medea doze;  
 Let them with Dodsley wail Cleone's woes,  
 Whilst he, fine feeling creature, all in tears,  
 Melts as they melt, and weeps with weeping peers;  
 Let them with simple Whitehead, taught to creep  
 Silent and soft, lay Fontenelle asleep;  
 Let them with Browne contrive, no vulgar trick,  
 To cure the dead, or make the living sick;  
 Let them in charity to Murphy give  
 Some old French piece, that he may steal and live;

Let



Let them with *antick* Foote subscriptions get,  
And advertise a summer-house of wit.'

We really, excepting the last line, can find no wit or humour in this quotation, the whole of which is as void of poetry as of justice. The reader will scarcely doubt of Mr. Churchill's paying his compliments to Scotch writers in the same strain of abuse, which we shall forbear to quote, because we are sorry if Churchill was the author of such a dull, pitiful, frantic production.

18. *A Morning's Meditation, or, a Descant on the Times. A Poem.*  
Pr. 1s. 6d. Richardson and Urquhart.

This is a splenetic, enthusiastical, unnatural rant, conceived in spite, and delivered in doggrel. The following lines are the most tolerable in the whole poem.

' See! what a hideous monster yonder struts,  
*Goliath's* size—**MONOPOLY** by name—  
Stalks ghastly 'mongst the throng, his rolling eyes  
Flash baneful avarice at ev'ry glance,  
At ev'ry step wide devastation spreads!  
Pale, meagre **FAMINE**, following at his heels;  
No seed of virtue's living in his soul,  
Meek sympathy, benevolence and truth—  
The common feelings of humanity  
Are banish'd—Int'rest's base, mere selfish laws,  
Guides ev'ry step, and ev'ry act inspires.  
See! in his hand a cruel scythe he holds,  
Nor sweeps it 'mongst the *pigmy* multitude,  
Destruction's dealt around at every sweep,  
And thousands fall fast by his pond'rous side;  
See! thunder-struck the gaping throng aghast,  
Stand trembling—

We should not have troubled our readers with this quotation, did not the state of the times render it preferable to any other passage of this miserable performance.

19. *The Courtesan. By the Author of the Meretriciad. Pr. 2s. 6d.*  
Harrison.

We have already (See Vol. XII. P. 201.) given an opinion of this author's talents, morals, and genius. The poem before us confirms the judgment we then passed; only we think this performance has a little more decency, but less wit, than the *Meretriciad*. The doctrine contained in the following lines

lines certainly requires some attention, whatever censure, in other respects, may be due to the author.

‘ Some men there are who seek a kind of name,  
And think it great to wound a woman’s fame;  
Curs’d be that man, whose bale degenerate breast  
Allures the maid to ruin, when possess’d  
Leaves her on seas of grief, promiscuous hurl’d,  
The scorn of kindred, and a scornful world;  
For C\* wrongs, such should by heav’n be curst,  
And of such cowards M\* the first.  
Sweet injur’d innocence, whom savage man,  
By various wiles has studied to trepan;  
Who dead to ev’ry tender virtue, boasts  
Your fall, once queen of all the neighb’ring toasts.  
But hear ye fair an absolution giv’n,  
An absolution surely meant by heav’n:  
Love, the most gen’rous passion of the mind,  
Softest asylum innocence can find;  
Love is not sin, but where ’tis sinful love,  
But when a crime, first pardon’d too above.  
It’s not the woman—it’s the man who swore  
Honour to you, and made the crime the more;  
Is there a sin? (if women sin at all)  
So very light, so very trivial;  
The first command God issu’d from the sky,  
Was to each pair—“encrease and multiply.”  
In pious days, amongst the chosen seed,  
The act of propagation was a meed:  
Then why should these more luscious days decree  
The female damn’d, and not the debauchee?  
Is this our pious, great religion too,  
O! shame upon’t! so old, so bad, so new:  
A neighbour’s fame traduc’d o’er dregs of tea,  
Is capital, is downright infamy.  
Is this religion?—where’s that parent’s heart  
Who damns his child? yet never weighs the art,  
The lures, the ways, the specious means combin’d  
To win her tender heart, her soul, her mind:  
Is there no pity for the babe we bred,  
“Nurs’d on our knees, and at our bosoms fed?”  
Say, can we from ourselves so soon depart,  
“So soon forget the darling of our heart?”  
Shall she, because her virgin honour’s torn  
By him she lov’d—become the public scorn?

Shall



Shall she for want to prostitution bend,  
 And 'mongst the brutes of lewdness search a friend,  
 Shall she find even pity in a bawd,  
 Or at a D\*'s feet lay down her load?  
 Shall she become a Magdalene, and find  
 A way to heaven shut against her kind?  
 Or shall her virtue (for 'tis virtue sure)  
 Make her for want of character, endure  
 The night's bleak air, the flinty street her bed,  
 Starving her babe, and dying, begging bread!  
 Or shall she let it tease the wither'd breast,  
 Till sinking in her wearied arms to rest,  
 Death closes up the clinging baby's eyes,  
 And the poor mother bursts with grief—and dies?

With regard to the execution of this piece, it is very sub-  
 sultory (a species of writing modern bards mistake for Pin-  
 daric) and personal; but we are too little acquainted with the  
 subject to pronounce it abusive,

20. *Oppression. A Poem. By an American. With Notes, by a*  
*North-Briton. 2s. Moran.*

Some readers may be good, or rather, ill-natured enough  
 to pronounce this piece to be of the hermaphroditical kind,  
 and hesitate to declare whether it partakes most of the witty,  
 or the dull. We labour under no difficulty in determining  
 that the latter is the prevailing gender: nor is the malevolence  
 which forms the ground-work of the whole, tinged with one  
 grain of wit or true satire. Scotland, Lord B. and the Mini-  
 stry, are the objects of the author's ill-nature; which is inter-  
 mingled with a great deal of private personal abuse on inferior  
 characters, both abroad and at home, military as well as civil.  
 We have selected the following passage, because we think it  
 contains the best lines in the poem, and because we would do  
 justice to the most despicable writer.

'B— is the man we only should detest,  
 As Union's foe, as England's greatest pest;  
 Before his horrid, dark, and gloomy reign,  
 The souls of Scotch and English were the same,  
 One general love presided through the land,  
 All like good brothers, gave to all their hand;  
 No party words, nor scornful taunts were us'd,  
 None for his country, or his tongue abus'd;  
 But now! oh strange! how alter'd, how unjust!  
 A nation, for the crime of one is curs'd.

' Blame

' Blame B—, ye Britons, don't despise that land,  
 Because they take what's offer'd to their hand :  
 On him alone, if curses you must pour,  
 Let loose your vengeance, and exhaust its store ;  
 Bid injur'd peace, its outmost fury shed,  
 And fall as pond'rous ruin on his head ;  
 Bid haggard conscience, treat him as her foe,  
 And like the rolling stone, give constant woe ;  
 Bid justice mark him, as it marks a knave,  
 And deep repentance, bow him to the grave ;  
 Till then, and only then, will England rest,  
 So deep the rancour in each English breast.'

21. *The Death of a Friend. A Poem, in blank Verse.* 4to. Pr. 6d.  
 Walter.

Very pious, very moral, and very dull. If the author really believes in a future state of existence and consciousness, he surely ought not to have persecuted his friend's ghost with such vile poetry.

22. *A Portrait of Oratory.* By J. Garner, M. D. 8vo. Pr. 2s.  
 Sandby.

We know not who this Mr. Garner is, or where he lives ; but we would advise him to avoid the purlieus of Moorfields, unless he can prove that he was afflicted with a raging fever when he wrote this pamphlet ; and procure some of his own profession to certify he is in a fair way of recovery.

23. *Letter from M. De Voltaire, to M. D'Am———, dated the 1st of March, 1765. Upon two tragical Incidents in France at the same Time ; that of Calas, and that of Sirven ; both on the Account of Religion.* 8vo. Pr. 6d. Becket.

If we are to judge of the character of a nation by this letter, the common people of France are the same barbarians the English were 400 years ago, when in every ward of the city of London they had a hatchet and a block, on which they cut off the heads of every man and woman who could not pronounce the words *bread and cheese* with the true English accent. M. Voltaire, in this Letter, erects himself into a sanctuary for the persecuted, and is wonderfully vain of doing an act of humanity, which a country parson or a trading justice in England would scarcely mention with any degree of self-approbation. After relating his endeavours to relieve the family of Calas he mentions a like persecution commenced against the Sirven family.



A man of that name had three daughters; one of which was forced into a nunnery, and whipped till she ran mad, and soon after drowned herself. The common people pretended that her father and mother, who were protestants, had put her to death; and these poor people were obliged to fly to Switzerland, where M. Voltaire does them the honour of his protection and patronage.

This letter is the composition of self-applause; and a writer who possesses delicate feelings would have blushed to make such a parade of his humanity to the publick.

24. *A Letter from a Gentleman in Town to his Friend in the Country; containing some interesting Particulars, said to be received from Abroad, relative to Jonas, the celebrated Conjuror.* Hooper. Pr. 6d.

This is a feeble attempt at wit and humour, on the threadbare subject of the conjurer Jonas. The letter-writer pays a visit to all the powers of Europe, the Pope, and the grand Turk among the rest; and shews the vast importance of the Conjuror to each; not without some rude, unmannerly insinuations, equally dull and scurrilous towards a certain great personage.

21. *The Holy Bible, containing the Old Testament and the New; carefully revised: with explanatory Notes, for the better understanding of those sacred Records.* 8vo. Pr. 1s. 6d. Henderson.

The editor very justly complains, that ' whilst profane authors, the poets of orators and antiquity, the historians and biographers of modern times have received all the elegance that the paper-mill and the press could bestow, the scriptures, more valuable than all the books in the world, and which exhibit more finished eloquence, more lofty metaphors, and a greater force of truth and reason, than any other writings, have not met with equal improvement; he therefore proposes in this edition, of which the book of Genesis is now published as a specimen, I. To redress the confusion, in which these writings are involved by rejecting the usual barbarous division of them into chapters and verses; the former introduced in the twelfth, and the latter no longer ago than the sixteenth century, viz. anno 1551: divisions which have misled the ignorant, and caused many thousand disputes, which otherwise had been never heard of in the world, and have tended not only to the discredit of the Scriptures, but of religion itself. Nevertheless, as it has so many years been continued, and concordances, paraphrases, com-

mentators

mentators and preachers have followed that method in their references and quotations, he has placed the chapters and verses, according to the common division, in the margin, that his edition may be equally useful to all persons with the common Bibles.

‘ Secondly, Though he has chosen to preserve the text, as it stands in the last translation, he has availed himself, by giving, in brief notes, the senses of learned divines and sacred critics, for the clearing up difficulties, and rectifying mis-translations, and has also exercised his own judgement, where it was not repugnant to that of more able writers. He has likewise throughout explained the technical terms; given the value of the Scripture coins; and reduced the weights and measures, of length and capacity, to our own standard. His arguments to each book, will form a clear synopsis of the Bible, and afford a pleasing history, which, even read alone, must greatly refresh the memory, and benefit the reader.

‘ Thirdly, He has frequently altered the punctuation; but not without consulting the best critics on that head.

‘ Upon the whole, the editor flatters himself, that this edition will be executed in such a manner as will give satisfaction to all ranks of people: being so calculated, that the several books may be kept apart, or united together, in such manner as the reader shall think proper. In fine, the nobleman, gentleman, scholar, and all degrees of people, will be now furnished with a pocket companion in the sacred oracles of divine truth; and he trusts this disposition of those books will be preferred to Horace, Virgil, Milton, &c. for surely, by all sincere Christians at least, Moses, the Prophets, David, Solomon, and St. Paul, are esteemed greatly superior to every profane author.’

We heartily applaud this useful design, having often reflected with concern on the mean appearance of the Bible, when we have seen it disgraced by ordinary paper, a wretched type, and a Gothic page.

We shall not however pretend to assure the reader that he will be satisfied with this edition. It is printed in an elegant form, but might have been improved by embellishments of various kinds; some chronology might have been introduced, and the interlocutions distinguished by inverted commas. The annotations can hardly be commended for any thing but their brevity. The author ought to explain his own remark, when he tells us, that the serpent, before the fall, was a more noble creature, a *flying seraph*. He should not absolutely assert that the land of Havilah was Colchis, and Pison the river Phasis: this hypothesis is exploded\*. He informs us that a *cunning hunter*

---

\* See Genesis xxv. 18. — 1 Sam. xv. 7.



*hunter is a skilful hunter ; that to bring down a person's grey hairs with sorrow to the grave, is, to make him die of grief ; that Jacob swooned away, when his heart fainted ; and that Joseph's brethren were chearful when they are said to have been merry.*

Such notes as these can neither contribute to the instruction of the reader nor the advantage of the publication !

26. *A Treatise on Parish Rates, occasioned by the Disputes that have lately arisen and are encreasing with much Heat and Animosity in many Parts of the Country. By an Impartial Hand. 4to. Price 1s. Baldwin.*

The author of this little piece seems to have studied his subject with particular attention. He states the difference which the law makes in fixing the church rate and the poor rate. He thinks that the manner of making the latter by church-wardens and overseers only, to be confirmed by two neighbouring justices, is liable to great objections, supposing the parties should disagree ; not to mention the absurdity of those four persons, not only taxing a whole parish, but themselves. He therefore thinks that to prevent the many disputes which this omission, defect, or inequality of the poor laws, has introduced, all the parish rates should be put upon the same footing, and made by the parish officers and the major part of the parishioners. He mentions some other inconveniences arising from the present poor laws, and thinks that there ought to be a *stated valuation* (of property) *justly and fairly made*, which in particular cases may be appealed to, and prevent inequalities, from whatever cause they may arise.

This writer next undertakes to prove, that Dr. Wood in his *Institutes* is inconsistent with himself in saying, 'that a taxation by the pound rate is the most equitable way, and not according to the quantity of the land.' He seems to think that respect ought to be had to the *quality* of the land, and that a pound rate, without any other consideration, may be unjust. As this subject is now before the parliament, we make no doubt but the author's observations will there have their due weight.

27. *A Letter to the Fellows of a College, concerning their Method of Fining ; with Tables for Renewals of Years expired in Leases of ten and twenty Years, and a Proposal to make the Interest of Money they allow their Tenants upon Renewals, the Standard for encouraging Enclosures by their Lessees, with a Table for that Purpose, useful to all Parties interested in Church and College Leases. 8vo. Pr. 6d. Fletcher.*

The title of this letter sufficiently shews its purposes. The calculations seem to be very exact, and to come from one who, from the present practice of fining, thought them necessary, to prevent college tenants *from having too good bargains.*

28. *The Free Masons Quadrille; with the Solitary. In French and English. With the Free Masons Minuet and Country Dance.* 12mo. Pr. 1s. Walter.

From the preface to this composition, we learn that the free-masons in France hold in their capital cities a lodge every week, to which their wives and daughters are admitted, as well as card playing, concerts, dancing, and *refreshments*. The quadrille here mentioned is calculated for those lodges, and its rules differ little from the other methods of playing that game, but in the names of the cards, which are conformed to the terms of masonry; Spadille, for instance, is the master, Basto the junior warden, &c. In the Chapter of Penalties, the fourth rule runs as follows :

‘ The terms of respect are subject to fines ; no other compliments should pass, than favour, sincerity, cordiality, union and fraternity ; as, *do me the favour ; I esteem you sincerely ; here you love you with all my heart, &c.* but as the English are as shy and little addicted to compliment, as the French, Germans, Italians are prodigal ; in this respect, the poor might very likely starve by the benefit arising from these penalties in England.’

This forced introduction of the English into such an article, gives us no favourable opinion of the French author being a man of either good sense or good breeding, tho’ he is very probably a man of quality and fashion. If he should be pleased to read the words of a song made by Mr. W. (not the laureat) about the close of the year 1759, he may possibly there find a definition of the true *English salute*, as practised by that excellent master of manners Sir Edward Hawke.

29. *A Review of Mr. Mayhew’s Remarks on the Answer to his Observations on the Character and Conduct of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.* By East Apthorp, M. A. 8vo. Pr. 1s. Rivington.

This controversy has long subsisted, with an acrimony that ought to be banished from the writings of reverend divines. The facts on which it turns are so much confined to America, that it is impossible for us to form any judgment where the superiority lies in argumentation. This publication, if the facts are as Mr. Apthorp has stated them, we think bids fair to be decisive of the controversy in favour of the society, and the established church. As to the policy or expediency of sending English bishops to America, the measure, if we are not misinformed, is now under the serious consideration of a high board ; and we think the mention of them in this dispute (till it shall be known what their appointments and powers are to be, if they are constituted) is premature.

